THE Lutheran Quarterly

Order No.	Quantity	Book No.	COLOR
116	48	41	16

CALL NO.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

Ads Out ☐

Have Rub ☐

Make Rub ☐

olume III FEBRUARY, 1951 Number 1

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

v. 3
1951

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume III FEBRUARY, 1951 Number 1

CONTENTS

SPIRIT IN THE THOUGHT OF NICHOLAS BERDYAEV—P. L. Holmer 3
CHRISTIAN LIBERTY AND SPIRITUAL GROWTH—William E. Hulme 23
POEMS — Frances Swarbrick 32
THE BACKGROUND OF LUTHERAN PARTICIPATION IN THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT — Stewart Herman 34
THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN RUSSIA — Edgars Kiploks 46
THE THEOLOGY OF EINAR BILLING — Gustav Wingren 60
NOTES AND STUDIES
The Weimar Edition of Luther's Works — R. Jauernig 70
A New Paragraph in Christian History — Ralph D. Heim 79
Wanted: A Theory of the Laity in the Lutheran Church—Conrad Bergendoff 82
BOOK REVIEWS
Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (A. C. P. Hays) — 91
Quimby, *The Great Redemption: Commentary on Romans* (R. D. Snyder) — 92
Asmussen, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser* (H. K. Ladwig) — 92
Johansson, *Bibelns värld och vår* (E. H. Wahlstrom) — 94
Wilder, *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus* (E. E. Flack) — 95
Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (R. D. Snyder) — 95
Goodspeed, *The Apostolic Fathers: an American Translation* (R. T. Stamm) — 96
Bewer, *The Book of Isaiah,* Vols. I and II (J. M. Myers) — 98
Williams, *God's Grace and Man's Hope* (E. M. Carlson) — 98
Heim, *Gottesglaube und die Naturwissenschaft* (M. J. Heinecken) — 103
Lewis, *Morals and the New Theology* (C. C. Rasmussen) — 104
Caemerer, *The Church in the World* (M. J. Heinecken) — 106
Lindroth, *Recent Theological Research in Sweden* (C. Bergendoff) — 106
Asmussen, *Warum noch Lutherische Kirche?* (U. S. Leupold) — 107
Friedmann, *Mennonite Piety through the Centuries* (A. R. Wentz) — 109
Kreider, *The Beginnings of Lutheranism in New York* (J. B. Moose) — 110
Lentz et al., *Story of the Midwest Synod* (W. D. Allbeck) — 111
Malmeström, *J. A. Eklund, En biografi* (C. Bergendoff) — 112
Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* (T. G. Tappert) — 112
Butterfield, *Christianity and History* (T. G. Tappert) — 112
Allport, *The Individual and his Religion* (H. D. Hoover) — 113
Heim, *Leading a Sunday Church School* (G. Aus) — 113
Garrett, *Growth in Prayer* (H. C. Leupold) — 114
Romoser, *Christ's "No"* (W. D. Streng) — 114
Books for Children of Various Ages — 114
Schlink et al., *Gutachten zur Dogmatisierung der Himmelfahrt* (T. G. Tappert) 115
Wedel, *The Christianity of Main Street* (G. Aus) — 115
Rutenber, *The Dagger and the Cross* (C. Bergendoff) — 116
Habel, *Snapshots* (R. D. Lechleitner) — 116
Suter and Cleaveland, *The American Book of Common Prayer* (H. C. Leupold) 117
Franke, *Evangelischer Aufbruch* (O. W. Heick) — 117
Echternach, *Der Kommende* (E. E. Flack) — 118
BOOKS RECEIVED — 119
CONTRIBUTORS — 120

PACIFIC LUTHERAN

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor
THEODORE S. LIEFELD
Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager
ANDREW S. BURGESS
Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.
Harvey D. Hoover
Abdel Ross Wentz

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.
Paul J. Hoh
T. G. Tappert

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.
C. G. Carlfelt
Eric Wahlstrom

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO
E. C. Fendt

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.
Andrew S. Burgess

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA
Bernard Holm

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aims:* The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

19356

Spirit in the Thought of Nicholas Berdyaev

P. L. Holmer

And all the words that I write,
Must spread out their wings untiring,
And never rest in their flight,
Till they come where your sad, sad heart is.[1]

IT IS with such a practical motive voiced by William Butler Yeats that Nicholas Berdyaev, the recent Russian philosopher, has ventured to disclose his thought. Beneath the vast erudition and the sometimes torturing argument one can always discern the design, viz., to relieve somehow the aching tragedy suffered by himself and his fellowmen. Both the misery and the grandeur of man are seen in Berdyaev's pages, which add testimony to Leon Bloy's aphorism—"Suffering passes away, but the fact of having suffered never passes away."[2]

Suffice it to say that Berdyaev was born in Russia and lived there until his expulsion by the Communists in 1922, when he became an emigre teacher first in Berlin and then in Paris. With wide and profound interests to guide him, he early became acutely conscious of the contemporary currents of history and thought, analyzing their antecedents and questioning their practical consequences. Communism in its many manifestations served as an intellectual back-drop for reflection from the very beginning of his philosophical career.[3] Apparently Berdyaev himself was never a violent revolutionist-Communist for he early (1900) distinguished

1 William Butler Yeats, "Where My Books Go," *The Book of English Verse* (Oxford, 1923), p. 1038.

2 Cf., Berdyaev's pages on suffering in *Freedom and the Spirit* (Scribners, 1935). Also, M. Spinka, *Nicholas Berdyaev: Captive of Freedom* (Westminster, 1950), pp. 125 ff.

3 *The Origin of Russian Communism* (London: T. Clarke, 1938), p. 232, notes 26 and 27. Also, *The Russian Idea* (Macmillans, 1948) and the long introd. to *Slavery and Freedom* (Scribners, 1944).

between cultured Marxists who were idealists and religious, and those who were prematurely preparing for "the advent of Communism"; and he chose to cast his lot with the former.[4]

Henri Bergson has said that before man can philosophize, man must live.[5] One could certainly agree that Nicholas Berdyaev has "lived," and deeply so, for one can almost feel the "Vital Necessity" from which his convictions originate. He noted well the relationships between ideas and things, thought and history. The tragic character of his own life sharpened all the issues for him.

But to say this, is not to say that Berdyaev is a miscellaneous, random sort of thinker, concerned only with scattered problems. Rather, Berdyaev writes philosophy in a grand synthetic style, attempting to deal with both the broadest and most general implications on the one side and the most particular applications of ideas on the other. This is not to say that his intellectual bravery is always rewarded with success, but he tries nonetheless. He does not begin with the problems presented by the history of the subject; instead, he begins with "the problems that press upon me"[6] which have to be solved in order that he, the philosopher, might live with a maximum of wisdom.

Philosophy has as a consequence a "useful function," a certain pragmatic justification, because it relates to one's living. And one is soon aware in any of Berdyaev's volumes that philosophizing is a most serious endeavor, a necessity rather than a luxury, a task rather than a game. Certainly this disposition lends passion to his short shrift with epistemology and analytical techniques. Philosophy, he would say, must begin with the real world, fuzzy and ill-defined as it is, rather than with the clear conceptions of it.

Berdyaev's philosophy is a part of a long intellectual biography. Undoubtedly it could be best understood by proceeding chronologically book by book. But this procedure does not lend itself easily to the demands of a short paper. Therefore because the argument seems to lead logically from the description of the function

4 Berdyaev, *The Russian Revolution* (Sheed & Ward, 1932). Cf., translator's introd., p. x; Spinka, *op. cit.*, Part One.

5 Bergson, *Two Sources of Morality and Religion* (H. Holt, 1935), p. 165.

6 *Solitude and Society* (Scribners, 1938), p. 30.

of man in history to the non-historical ontological nature of man, it would seem wise to inquire into one of man's peculiar functions, that of knowing (intellectualism, abstraction, valuing, etc.), and proceed, secondly, to the metaphysical description of man. Because such a philosophical view is thought to be a prerequisite to an understanding of Christianity, it becomes appropriate, thirdly, to examine Berdyaev's view of Christianity.[7]

II

Through all of Berdyaev's writings there is a strain of thought which, inaccurate as the term may be, can be called anti-intellectual in character. If one can accept William James' delineation of the claim of intellectualism to be that conceptual logic is the final authority in the world of being or fact and that the logic of identity defines most acutely and comprehensively the nature of reality, one can most assuredly call Berdyaev an anti-intellectualist.[8] He says: "We have lost all confidence in the possibility and fruitfulness of an abstract metaphysics."[9] By this declaration he does not repudiate all metaphysics, for he is as concerned as any philosopher could be with the nature of man, God, and the world; but he does repudiate all abstract systems which have attained their systematization and lost their fruitfulness because of their abstraction from concreteness and the moil and toil of daily living. Berdyaev begins with the problem of his life; he cannot begin with a system and concern himself with the logical validity of its form or the adequacy of its content.

The distrust of intellectualism in the sense in which we have defined the term takes several forms. First of all he is wary concerning abstract definitions of reality, metaphysical and scientific.

7 The general statements here made are perhaps best substantiated by the following references: the "Preface" to *Freedom and the Spirit* and the *Destiny of Man* (London: Bles, 1937), Pt. I, Ch. I; Pt. II, Ch. IV. Also, see the essay by Lampert, *N. Berdyaev* (in *Modern Christian Revolutionaries*), pp. 309-381.

8 Bergson, *Creative Evolution* (Holt, 1916), all of Ch. I. Also, *An Introduction to Metaphysics* (Putnam, 1912), p. 9, where B. gives the case for saying: "Metaphysics, then, is the science which claims to dispense with symbols." Wm. James' claim is on different grounds, cf., *A Pluralistic Universe,* pp. 213 ff.

9 *Freedom and the Spirit,* "passim."

He would instead always clothe the metaphysical with humanity or otherwise discard it. Then too, he has nothing but contempt for the general opinion that we can discuss the question of the "good" of man in abstract terms. Normative and legalistic ethics which aim to do so are "terrible" because they strive to make man into an automaton of a powerless virtue. The disavowal of abstract "realities" and "goods" here does not entail another comprehensive metaphysical view; rather it inheres in a certain ethical view concerning man.[10] This latter conviction, though ultimately metaphysical even in Berdyaev's writings, derives from the observation and judgment that there is "just cause to lament, what man has made of man." The lamentable result of man's concern with "reality" and the "good" in the abstract is a certain dissolution of man through the separation of the object (real) and the subject. Abstractions which claim to constitute reality make of a man a reflector of the real, a kind of shadowgraph.[11]

Berdyaev argues that the duality between the knower and the known, the object standing over against the knowing subject, is not the primary experience of men, but is a secondary experience, a result of reflection. Knowledge becomes a derivation of reality. And opposed to this view, Berdyaev insists that the primary fact is that knowledge too is a reality and takes place in reality. It is not a derivation and that alone; for knowledge is "an act in and through which something happens to reality." Knowledge is an instance of the creativity of life because it represents "being" cognizing "being," the real thinking the real.

If one were to look for analogies in contemporary philosophy, one would need to look only at the writings of John Dewey; for he too has considered at length the question of subject-object duality. And with a violently different purpose he too has tried to show that

10 *Destiny* . . . ; cf., esp. Ch. III, entitled "Man" and pp. 109 and 122. Berdyaev's own position is treated against the background of other Russian thinkers in *The Russian Idea,* esp., Ch. X. For an understanding of these issues from an Augustinian point of view, and in complete independence of Berdyaev, see Frank, *Philosophical Understanding and Religious Truth* (Oxford, 1945), Ch. I, "The Nature of Man" and notes, pp. 18 ff.

11 *Destiny,* p. 4 and rest of first chapter. Also, O. F. Clarke, *Introduction to Berdyaev* (London: 1950), pp. 122-140.

knowledge is a part of reality, not about reality.[12] By insisting that knowledge is an activity and hence another instance of "process," Dewey is able to give to knowledge itself the same status as any other reality, whatever its locus.

Berdyaev argues for a significant identity between the knower and the known and, in addition, a certain identity between ideas and the supposed external world. He seems to relate ideas to objects, not as images or copies are related to things, but as purposes stand related to ends, though to be sure this is not his language. Knowledge is not about something, it *is* something. Consequently, one does not have ideas about the real, but one has the real in two forms, as knowledge and as things. The opening chapter of the *Destiny of Man* aims to show that Plato, Plotinus, St. Augustine, Pascal, and Boehme were both knowers and known. They did not content themselves with "ideas of" because they did not believe that they stood outside of all that was real. The modern thinker ". . . refuses to form part of reality and does not want his knowing to be a living existential act."[13]

The philosopher and knower is thus a part of reality and so is his knowledge. Man exists before he apprehends the fact of his existence, and this fact ought to be evident in his consciousness of himself. Whatever apprehension of reality (or Being, which term Berdyaev prefers) man gets is possible only because he is a part of Being. Therefore, there is an anthropological characteristic revealed by the nature of knowledge, as well as the content of knowledge. All knowledge is derived from man and from the object outside of man. Knowledge is an expression then of a living experience, of life's creative energy, of a personality's participation in a dramatic movement. The supposed duality in Western theology and philosophy between object and subject means a self-confinement of man. Berdyaev would have knowledge to be understood as the means whereby true communion could be established between

12 Dewey, *Experience and Nature* (Open Court, 1923), Chapters I and VI. Also, his essay "The Objectivism-Subjectivism of Modern Philosophy," *Problems of Men*, pp. 309-322.

13 *Destiny*, p. 5.

a man and other men, between man and the universe, and between God and man.

Previously the statement was made that Berdyaev conceives the relationship between the idea and the object or between knowledge and the objects of knowledge to be one best expressed in terms of purposes and ends. He says: "Knowledge, indeed, is humanization in the deepest ontological sense of the word."[14] The subject is active, not passive; what the knower adds in the knowing relationship is that which humanizes the world. But what of the knowledge itself?

The idea, isolated and independent of the knower and the known, would seemingly reflect both the purpose on the part of the knower and the real world, "the something I know not what" of the external world. No idea, no bit of knowledge, can be understood as void of purpose or of intention. No knowledge is ever pure objectivity or mere reflection. Nor ought it so to be; for knowledge which is completely devoid of "interest" is the lowest sort. One is reminded here of the Kierkegaardian phrase which says that only that truth which edifies is truth for men.

Berdyaev would admit that the denial of the subject-object dualism in a sense complicates the issue; but he is not averse to making things harder if the easier explanation seems to emasculate the significance of man.[15]

Be that as it may, the reader must remember that questions of "fore-and-aft," ground and consequent, prior-to, etc., are ultimately irrelevant in Berdyaev's universe. Reciprocity seems to ob-

14 *Society and Solitude*, p. 28. In this section of the Book, B. discusses what he calls "the gnosiological problem of solitude" (cf., pp. 25-30). Today when most knowledge is justified in terms of what it can mean to others, B. seems like a stranger from another world.

15 B. does not consider his responsibility that of removing difficulties. He is content to help others find them. His criticism of Communism is to the effect that it presupposes, and posits action upon, too simple a view of man, an economic animal. Hence, the solution is too simple—increased production, equality of this and that, etc. Here, note all of his writings on Communism (bibliography) and his remarks about Tolstoy, *The Russian Idea*, "passim." He argues also that the advantages offered by mechanistic views of society and man are many—they are all simple and predictive and allow for "solutions" to problems. Their difficulty is—they are all false! Cf., Spinka, *op. cit.*, "Berdyaev's Existentialism," pp. 93-112.

tain between all things, ideas, subjects, and spirits. It is in this sense that Berdyaev is a dialectical thinker. And if knowledge is a humanization, then it is an increase in Being. This means that there is a certain constitutive function of knowledge. But knowledge and Being are not identical, though both share an ontological status. Knowledge adds to something already given. It is an illumination of Being; it is an instance of Being transcending Being.

This view seems to indicate a certain affinity between Berdyaev and the existential philosophers and particularly Sören Kierkegaard. With the latter, the Russian philosopher would say that knowledge which is essential to one's living never becomes knowledge, or better "truth" until it is appropriated into a man's acting. Existential knowledge is essential to all men because it will mean not knowing the good, but being good. This is true because man is an existing being; he must always think about his existence which already is but is not perfect. Man becomes more than what he is at any moment not by knowing abstractly, but by translating purposes and ideas into character thus adding to the measure of himself. This for Berdyaev is an instance of the creativity and humanization that knowing permits.[16]

III

It should be obvious that Berdyaev cannot for long discuss knowledge without involving himself in a discussion concerning the nature of the activity of the knower. Remarks have been made to indicate that knowledge by itself begins with a purpose or an intention and this is related to an end (which particular will be treated later). This is not to deny a certain reflective character of knowledge; but at the same time it does argue for a creative aspect, manifest in the knower, who is not, in all respects at least, determined by Being, but who is anterior to Being, "who is absolutely original."[17]

Berdyaev says in criticism of *De Servo Arbitrio* that Luther

16 *Sol. and Soc.*, p. 75. For discussion of these issues, see Spinka, *op. cit.*, p. 74 and pp. 100 ff. (E.g., "Meanings are created solely by personalities . . . ," p. 101).

17 *Destiny*, p. 46. See also, Clarke, *op. cit.*, "Man, Freedom and Knowledge," pp. 79-92.

ascribed everything to grace and divine intervention and nothing to human action and human freedom. Man's creativity to Luther was a manifestation of grace, i.e., God as cause once removed. But Berdyaev would argue that human nature was itself the genesis of creativity (this in addition to God). And this in the highest reaches of human development and most peculiarly respecting knowledge, philosophical and religious. Man is a maker, not only a *homo sapiens* but also a *homo faber.*[18]

Every knowing relationship evinces this creativity. For there is no meaning in the objective per se. Nor are meanings revealed to a man who is passive in relation to things, whatever they might be. Man always reaches out to find meanings. Man in the process of intellection adds something to what he receives. One is reminded here of the view of St. Thomas—*"Actio intellectus agentis in phantasmatibus praecedit receptionem intellectus possibilis."*[19] Berdyaev seems to argue for the activity of the intellect—"it endows the object with meaning, and establishes a similitude, a common measure between the knowing subject and the known object." Meaning is created by man's activity and indicates that "reality is conformable to man." The real to man has meaning because it has an anthropological reference. This does not mean that reality is a logical construct or that thinking constitutes the world. Such a thesis would involve an exaggeration of the "activity of the gnosiological subject," Berdyaev would say; and it would mean too that man as a being submerged in the "first life prior to all rationalization" would be forgetting that he discovers his existence after having existed, not before.[20]

Several conclusions then follow of which two are extremely important. The knowing subject is never disinterested, dispassionate, and only a recipient. Why? because life is for man a quest for satisfactions. Man does not live in categories of an impersonal and non-emotional sort as, for example, those of metaphysics or science; but he does live in terms of valuations. In this regard Ber-

18 *Sol. and Soc.*, p. 18.

19 St. Thomas, quoted by Etienne Gilson, *The Philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (Herders, 1937), p. 263.

20 *Sol. and Soc.*, and *The Destiny of Man*, pp. 18, 12, 59 and 5 respectively.

dyaev finds support in thinkers like Nietzsche and Kierkegaard who assert again and again that life is an evaluating process. And like them Berdyaev insists that the true creator is the creator of values. Even the structure of knowledge itself indicates this creativity. This is why Berdyaev says so passionately that man's function is "not to reflect, but to create."[21]

Berdyaev views the transformation of the object into knowledge under two aspects—one of objectification and report, and secondly, as an orientation of the subject. Man seeks to live in a world with meanings. In this doctrine Berdyaev has set himself the task of denying the intellectualistic theories of the human mind. In two volumes, *Solitude and Society* and *The Destiny of Man,* the traditional views of the nature of knowing and the knower are damned with very faint praise. In both treatises he argues for the primacy of freedom as the "essential condition of the existential subject," which, in turn, means a repudiation of all knowing theories which assume external principles or determinations. Likewise the negation includes such theories of the knower that would make his mind to be a *tabula rasa* or only form-contributing. Man, it is urged, is never a constellation of categories into which impressions are poured by the external world; he is rather an evaluator whose purpose and intentions determine and limit the sensations and give to the perceptions their ultimate meaning.[22]

In this world of tension the subject-object duality is denied by Berdyaev because it tends to reduce knowledge to a reflection of reality rather than allowing it to function as another reality. And secondly, we have tried to indicate that the function of knowledge as a part of reality is to humanize the world which is the arena for men with concerns and interest. Life is then a quest for satisfactions and every man is a pilgrim on a quest.

21 This is the argument of Ch. VIII, "The Reality of the Spirit," *Spirit and Reality* (London: Bles, 1939).

22 For example, see Berdyaev's evaluation of Kant in his earlier works (not translated) as reported by Spinka, pp. 73-75. Also, *The Destiny of Man,* pp. 15-16, and *The Divine and the Human,* the introduction and pp. 30 ff. In *Spirit and Reality,* he makes a strenuous plea for a new understanding of the importance of the self, p. 32.

IV

To attain knowledge then is to engage in a process; and knowing presupposes a kind of intentional activity. To describe knowing solely as a process is not however sufficient. By insisting upon the evaluative, purposive nature of knowing, Berdyaev is involved in the task of relating the ends, ideals, choices, values, proposed by man because he is free and creative, to the real world. Dewey makes all ideals hypotheses which are tested in the manner of scientific theories in the real world. If they satisfy, they are true; and knowledge becomes creative when ideals are found to be adequate plans for action. But Berdyaev is not content with so plausible a solution. He discerns breaks in the continuity which prevent him from placing man in the ready categories of naturalism which Dewey uses.

There is a relationship obtaining between values and facts, but, what precisely it is, Berdyaev finds difficulty in stating. In a manner reminding one of idealistic thinkers, he says that there is a transcendent end of knowing which is discerned by the simplest of men in knowing much less. If one can use traditional terms for a moment, one might say that there are two ends in view in all knowing: one is a kind of immanent and immediate end to be gained by description, analysis, objectivity, science, and scholarship; the other is a remote and transcendent end, or to avoid a static term and at the same time adhere more closely to Berdyaev's writings, a human destiny.[23] And this is the orientation of knowing, of all knowing, which Berdyaev calls humanistic. Possibly this Russian philosopher can be called an idealist, but the transcendent end is not that which idealists propose, the ultimate coherence. It is, rather, a destiny which can be pursued but not defined. Once we attain any end which we assume is the final end, there are discrepancies by the score; for already we create other ends. Thus, the saint who fulfills every canon of goodness remains a sinner to his own judgment. Thus, too, no moral man ever becomes a "good" man because as soon as his conduct agrees with definitions of the good, his definitions become obsolete. Man seeks to go beyond good

23 This is why he writes about the destiny of man.

and evil because he is creative and can not be bound by even moral principles.[24]

Does man share in the creation of the world through cognition as Fichte's argument would lead one to believe? Berdyaev's answer is a decisive "no." For every man works with the God-given. "The material for human creativeness is borrowed from the world created by God."[25] But God's creation is incomplete and man's active collaboration means action with God, not by God. But what then of the given world? Even that as we know it, is partly created by man; for the world as he knows it is beautiful or ugly, barren or rich, and is man-created to this extent. Man's creativity is a mark of his peculiarity in the universe. Everything is to a man as he values it, not as he sees it. However, this point of view does not cause Berdyaev to argue that man is a creator of lies as Nietzsche would say.

Though man can know the objective world through objective ideas, this is not enough. For with Nietzsche, Kierkegaard, and Pascal, Berdyaev would say that . . . "the objective world has no criterion or source of truth." But where Nietzsche considers the *anmenschlichung* character of knowledge "one possible idiosyncracy among many others,"[26] Berdyaev would say that the humanization of the external world is man's glory. To be subjectively concerned about the objective world is the clue to satisfying the deepest impulses of one's nature and it means transforming the objective world in conformity to one's destiny as a moral being.

From whence does this transcendence derive? The mystery of knowledge, as Berdyaev avers, lies in the knowing that we know. The door by which one could properly enter the extremes reached by Berdyaev's thought is right here. As indicated above, certain criteria of value have an important place in knowing. And, "since there is no way of apprehending meaning without a criterion of values, its apprehension is primarily based on the knowledge of

24 Cf., *Sp. and Reality,* p. 171, and *Destiny, "passim."*

25 *Sol. and Soc.,* p. 45.

26 The quotation is from Nietzsche's *Will to Power,* Vol. II (Eng. translation, London, 1910), p. 30.

the heart."[27] This is a poetical manner of saying that apprehension involves faith and fact. And the faith means a kind of active intuition which is the sine qua non of knowledge in the highest reaches. Philosophical knowledge is "therefore based upon a maximum experience of human existence."[28] But this does not imply that such knowledge is outwardly autonomous; rather it is dependent upon the whole life of the human engaged in the pursuit of knowledge.

One of the forms of intuition and that which Berdyaev calls the greatest is revelation. It is a spiritual experience of the whole man. It is not a form of intellectual apprehension, but it is an "inner Transformation" providing "realities and data of a mystic order."[29] Lest anyone assume that Berdyaev believes in revelation as a panacea to all problems, mark well his words:

> It is impossible to prove the existence of spiritual experience to one who knows nothing about the soul life . . . for one cannot compel such a person to recognize the existence of spiritual realities. Spiritual experience alone can provide us with proof of its existence; . . . The reality of God cannot be "inserted" or demonstrated from without. . . . The spiritual life must first reveal itself in a man.[30]

This is then an experience of man as spirit. By this higher form of knowledge, intuition or revelation, man is made aware of himself and his destiny. One learns, so to speak, what one is and has been all the time. Also, abstract goods become wedded to existence because both are seen to be in the same universe. Revelation is the highest form of knowledge; but it is not knowledge of the highest good, but of the living being, a Personality. Revelation serves to put the self-development of man in place of the normative ideals as the end towards which existence must be spent.

It can be pointed out here that a certain condition must be met before revelation becomes possible for any individual. Berdyaev would say that everyone must have some convictions which admit

27 *Destiny,* p. 15.
28 *Sol. and Soc.,* p. 17.
29 *Destiny of Man,* pp. 4 and 17-19.
30 *Freedom and the Spirit,* p. 12 and *Soc. and Sol.,* pp. 18 ff.

of the possibility of spiritual experience before he can know a revelation. This need not be a philosophical view worked out in all its explicitness. But again Berdyaev would remind us that there are permissive convictions at the bottom of every faith. Because some philosophies exclude the possibility of faith while others would predispose it as inadequate childishness, Berdyaev seeks to provide with philosophy, not the faith but a few convictions which might allow it.

It is evident that Berdyaev is a metaphysician, though it is equally evident that his metaphysics does not come by way of response to the query—what kind of universe and God can I know? Metaphysics, to Berdyaev, comes not after physics but literally after man. He seems to be asking with almost brazen anthropomorphism—what kind of man, universe, and God is presupposed by man's functioning? It should be clear by this time that Berdyaev does not give great credence to objective accounts, the abstract reports, etc., of man's thinking about other men, the world, or even the so-called objectively communicable contents of God's revelation. Knowledge of this sort cannot finally disclose the essential nature of man, his God, and his universe; for it presupposes the validity of the very object-subject duality which Berdyaev believes man's nature causes him to deny. All ultimate dualities are denied because what man shares with all to which he is in opposition is precisely what is essential to each human's life. Man is in "communion" with all else.[31]

By reflection upon knowing (whatever form) and the transformation of objective ideals into a world fit for human existence Berdyaev proposes finding meaning to man's activity. And these meanings provide a certain metaphysic of the spirit. "The mystery of reality is not solved," says Berdyaev, "by concentrating on the object, but by reflecting on the action of the subject."[32] We have called the action of the subject a function and we have noted several kinds of functioning—valuing, intuiting, creating, etc.,—all a part

31 Note the references in Spinka, *op. cit.*, to Berdyaev's last work (1949) where this position is apparently reiterated; pp. 100 ff. and fn., p. 203.

32 *Sp. and Real.*, p. 4.

of knowing. By devious means, none exacting in the sense that they could be called scientific, Berdyaev finds that freedom, meaning, creativity, integrity, love, value, are so many attributes of a being called man. But not of man as a biological creature. All of these attributes are attributes of the spirit which is inward, which cannot be rationalized, and which is finally "apophatic." This does not presuppose a distinction between body and spirit in the manner of Descartes; for man's own experience of and with himself indicates that he is always a personality. Divisions of man into the extended and the non-extended violate the constant experience of human integrity which we all have.

But what is "spirit"? It is neither an objective reality nor a rational category of being.

> Spirit has never existed, nor can it exist anywhere, in the form of a real object. The philosophy of spirit should not be a philosophy of being or an ontology, but a philosophy of existence. . . . Spirit inheres only in the subject, who alone is existential. Spirit is revealed in the subject. . . .[33]

God then is the great subject, the great Spirit, who cannot be thought but must be lived existentially, as it were. God is the greatness of the universe, the meaning of it; He informs actuality with purpose and gives the Divine breath to all life.[34]

Immediately the question occurs: Do our subjective states and experiences correspond to anything outside of ourselves? Are they merely states of mind in a psychological sense? Is there spirit behind our spiritual experiences? To Berdyaev this is a false formulation of the question. Such a query is vitiated by the assumption that God and the spiritual universe are objects which can be known objectively. In the noblest possible pragmatic fashion, Berdyaev would only say that one can only confirm the reality of God by existing as if He were there. Believing that God is a spirit means that the thinker must give up all hope of proving His existence. God as a spirit must be worshiped but not cross-examined. Spir-

33 *Op. cit.*, Ch. II, and quotes, pp. 4-6.

34 The totality of B.'s writings might be utilized to show the relevance of this point. Esp., *Spirit and Reality* and *Destiny*.

itual experiences, Berdyaev says quite frankly, do not correspond to anything. They must be believed to be as they are. "They are the prime reality, they are more existential than anything reflected in the objective world."

Man is a creative and free spirit. But what then is the relation obtaining between man and what we are led to believe is the world outside of him and, in turn, between man and God? If we consider the latter first, we find that man is free in God and from God. Man does not emanate from God alone; for this would mean (and I omit the premises of the syllogisms) that God would always be confronted with Himself; and, secondly, that evil was determined by God. Rather than these, Berdyaev would posit a God limited by men's choices. Freedom is revealed in human existence. Man is free to sin even to the extent of denying his God. Freedom itself is the spontaneous origin of creativity and evil. This is what we know by reflecting upon ourselves and our action.

As we approach this limit of rationalization (and with Kant, Berdyaev would admit antimonies in thought) Berdyaev says that we are justified in calling the ground of freedom the *Ungrund,* always remembering, however, the symbolic and myth-like character of such a term. Most of Berdyaev's speculation at this point is based upon German speculative mysticism, particularly Eckhardt and Boehme. With them, he would claim to know apophatically once again that out of the "Divine Nothing," the *Gottheit* or the *Ungrund,* comes the creation of the world. But God used the "nothing" to create the world. "Man is thus the child of God and the child of freedom."[35]

Because there seems to be little to say positively or negatively about the *Ungrund,* we shall consider at greater length certain aspects of this spiritual world as Berdyaev sees them. With contemporary philosophers like Dewey, Whitehead, and Bergson, he would admit that the universe must be considered in terms of a "dynamism" rather than "statism." He says: "An ontologically oriented *Weltanschauung* is static, whereas a pneumatologically

35 *Destiny,* pp. 32 ff. Compare his treatment here with *Sp. and Real.,* pp. 38 and 114 ff. Also, Spinka, "Origin and Berdyaev," *Church History,* Mr., '47.

oriented one is dynamic."[36] Corollary to this, Berdyaev would add, and once again in agreement with his contemporaries, that change is incremental. Creativity apparently means the emergence of something new. And one can discern in all of this an assumption underlying a great deal of thinking of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, viz., that the effect is larger than the cause. Thus man though created can be more than God made him because he can create of himself (but with God's grace) something new which God does not command. In this sense, man can produce a world greater (or lesser) than the cause, God. Consequent to these views and involved in them is the very considerable attention paid to the problem of Time, which is "the fundamental problem of human existence." But here again time is important because a man's destiny is realized in time. "Time exists because of activity, . . ." One need not pause for illustration of the importance of this problem in the philosophy of our day.[37]

V

Though the question of the religious implications of these general views is too large for adequate treatment here, we shall note briefly the trend of the argument. Christ is the revealed God-Man. For us, He means that in spite of our sin we are spiritual beings. Revelation is to be answered with creativity. Through Christ a bilateral Divine-Human process becomes possible. What more is implied by the place of Christ in history is difficult to ascertain in Berdyaev's writings. His Christology seems to be loosely articulated if one can call such ejaculatory phrases as the following part of a Christology:

> . . . the Coming of Christ . . . constitutes the central fact of history. . . The exceptionally dynamic and historical character of Christianity is the result of the fact that it conclusively revealed for the first time the existence of the principles of freedom. . . . The Christian Redemption wrought by the coming of the Divine Man, the God-Man, . . . restituted the power of freedom and

36 *Sol. and Soc.*, p. 129.
37 *The Divine and the Human*, "Introduction."

the image of his high divine origin to man, thus erasing the imprint of his slavery. . . . [38]

It seems to follow that the efficacy of Christ's sufferings and expiatory blood inheres in the fact, not that "He did it once and for all," but, that He did it at all. Christ demonstrated the possibility of liberation of the human subject and, as a consequence, released a "historical dynamism into the life of the Western peoples." Berdyaev denounces herewith, as Spinka has said, the Western juridical theory of the Atonement, common to both Catholics and Protestants.[39]

It would seem that the redemptive action initiated by Christ was carried on very effectively by the Saints:

> The result of man's Christian liberation from nature was that he retired into an inner spiritual world where he undertook a tremendous heroic struggle against the natural elements in order to overcome his subjection to baser nature and to forge an image of himself as a free human personality. This great undertaking, one of the central facts of man's destiny, was achieved by the Christian Saints, who . . . finally achieved man's liberation from the baser elements.[40]

And it would seem to be true of Berdyaev's view that it demands that every man become a redeemer through Christ in the measure that he is able to re-create himself, literally in the measure that he is able to add to his stature the personality and Divine Image that he is. Thus Christ is the initiator of redemption through whom other men may discover creative love and the destiny which is their own.

One can immediately discern differences between Berdyaev and St. Thomas and of course Karl Barth. He seems to be a kind of Platonist and closer to Origin and Plotinus, if one must trace affinities, than he is to either of the above named.[41] But, to mark the differences is not saying enough, for there is a similarity which

38 *The Meaning of History,* pp. 108 ff.
39 Spinka, *op. cit.,* p. 136. See also, *Destiny,* pp. 31-47.
40 The origin of this quotation, I cannot trace.
41 Vernon J. Bourke, "The Gnosticism of Berdyaev," *Thought,* 1936.

is far more striking. We have been heirs to religious thinking which has isolated the moral teaching of Christianity from the theology of the church. But for Berdyaev, the ethics of the Christ cannot be independent of the dogmas promulgated concerning Him. But neither does this mean a loud and vehement reassertion of the truth of the dogmas. The dogmas must be rethought and the ethics must become theological—this must be done again and again. "The Ethics of Creativeness," a chapter in one of his books, is apparently an attempt to think anew the old. This chapter sums up rather well too the dogmas which he thinks are essential to the continuing intellectual life of the Church. As we have indicated concerning the dogma of the Incarnation, the rethinking has meant thinking away some of the traditional doctrine; but be it said to his credit, Berdyaev has thought positively and has, therefore, something to say beyond the negation.

One cannot help admiring Berdyaev's intellectual courage. He is capable of a high degree of intellectual detachment and is able to become extremely objective about the matters which concern him most. He seems to carry easily the mark of a fine thinker, viz., the ability to think abstractly concerning his own time. He is able to withdraw sufficiently to gain a perspective. At the same time he is able to distinguish always between the ideal and the contemporary social form of the ideal. The moral challenge in his writings seems to come from the fact that he always shows that the ideal remains yet to be appropriated. Never does he renege to the extent of glorifying the social manifestation of the ideal or of claiming that the improbability of the ideal's realization demeans it to irrelevancy. In this sense, Nicholas Berdyaev is a thinker dedicated to the service of an ideal.

If one were to single out an ideal, or more simply an idea to which he is dedicated, it would certainly be that of Christianity. Perhaps one could describe his theology as loosely Platonistic and Johannine and note affinities with Gregory and Clement; but in another respect this becomes an injustice. His views of Christianity do not seem to be due so much to influences as they do to implications. He argues his points with freshness, even at times when one

feels that he could be repeating another. Berdyaev defines Christianity in terms of the highest ideality demanded by Jesus of Nazareth. It sits lightly on all "isms." It provides no nexus for identification with governments and historical characters. Christianity is not a type—historical, biblical, or Lutheran, and its content is at no one moment or place completely revealed to the world.

Thus the worth of Christianity cannot be measured by the worthiness or unworthiness of Christians, and though a Christian is "enlightened by the light of grace which comes from God, he accommodates this divine light to the eye of his own spirit and impresses on revelation the limitations of his own nature and consciousness."[42] Christianity of itself is not to blame but Christians are because of their pseudo-Christianity. But this again is a tragedy of a mysterious sort which arises because man denies that which can help. This life is so tragic because pseudo-Christianity gains power; and the world turns away from integral Christianity.

In a passage that is intended to provide a criticism of Communism we can find an illuminating phrase which sums up both the method and the content of Berdyaev's thinking. He says: "Religious psychology remains; only religious ontology is lacking." In this particular instance he is directing his shafts at the "bourgeoise-mindedness" which has permitted the imposition of the hideous kingdom of economic goodness upon men who first of all require freedom.[43] The religious ontology of the personality which could direct the religious fervor to its goal is missing. This is the situation in a much wider area of human enterprise, where mediocrity is enthroned because the picture of the personality has been dimmed. The present scene shall not cure itself. Christianity as the embodiment of the philosophy of the spirit, the ontological, shall yet save men.

> The hour is dawning when, after terrible struggle, after unprecedented de-Christianization of the world and its passage through all the results of that process, Christianity will be revealed in its pure form. Then it will be clear

42 The essay "The Worth of Christianity" appears in *The Bourgeois Mind* (Sheed and Ward). The quotation is found on p. 111.

43 Cf., *Dublin Review,* Vol. 193, pp. 178 ff.

what Christianity stands for and what it stands against. Christianity will again become the only and final refuge of man. And when the purifying process is finished, it will be seen that Christianity stands for man and for humanity, for the value and dignity of personality, for freedom, for social justice, for the brotherhood of men and of nations, for enlightment, for the creation of a new life. And it will be clear that only Christianity stands for these things.[44]

44 *The Fate of Man.* Compare this statement with *Toward a New Epoch,* pp. 36 ff.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works of Nicholas Berdyaev

The Bourgeois Mind and Other Essays (New York: Sheed and Ward), 1934.
"The Bourgeois Spirit," *Dublin Review,* Vol. 193, 1933, pp. 169-180.
Christianity and Class War (London: Sheed and Ward), 1933.
"The Crisis of Christendom," *Christendom,* Sp. 1937.
The Destiny of Man (London: G. Bles), 1937.
The Divine and the Human (New York: Macmillan), 1949.
Dostoievsky (New York: Sheed and Ward), 1934.
The End of Our Time (New York: Sheed and Ward), 1933.
The Fate of Man in the Modern World (Morehouse and Gorham Co.), 1935.
Freedom and the Spirit (New York: Scribners), 1935.
Leontiev (London: G. Bles), 1940.
The Meaning of History (London: G. Bles), 1936.
The Origin of Russian Communism (London: G. Bles), 1937.
The Russian Idea (New York: Macmillan), 1948.
Slavery and Freedom (New York: Scribners), 1944.
Solitude and Society (New York: Scribners), 1938.
Spirit and Reality (London: G. Bles), 1939.
Toward a New Epoch (London: G. Bles), 1949.
War and the Christian Conscience (London: Clarke), 1938.

Secondary Sources

E. E. Aubrey, "The Philosophy of N. Berdyaev," *Theol. Today,* Jan., 1948.
V. J. Bourke, "The Gnosticism of N. Berdyaev," *Thought,* 1936.
R. J. S. Hoffmann, "N. Berdyaev's Philosophy of History," *The American Review,* Vol. VIII, 1936-37, pp. 151 ff.
E. Lampert, "N. Berdyaev," *Modern Christian Revolutionaries,* ed. by D. Attwater, Devin-Adair Co., 1947.
Matthew Spinka, *Nicholas Berdyaev: Captive of Freedom,* Westminster Press, 1950.
M. Spinka, "Origin and Berdyaev: A Comparison," *Church History,* Mar., 1947.
Austin Warren, "A Note on N. Berdyaev," *The American Review,* Vol. 5, pp. 322 ff.
Oliver F. Clarke, *Introduction to Berdyaev* (London: G. Bles), 1950.

Christian Liberty and Spiritual Growth

William E. Hulme

ALREADY in the Old Testament God through his prophets promised the New Covenant. In this New Covenant God would put his laws into his people's hearts. The Old Covenant had its laws too, but they were outside rather than inside the heart. It was a legalistic covenant that prepared the way for the covenant of freedom; it was, as Paul called it, our pedagogue to bring us to Christ that we might be justified by faith. Now that we are under the New Covenant we no longer need the pedagogue.

The New Testament is the covenant of liberty—the Gospel of truth that Jesus said would make us free. It is my purpose to show that this freedom of the Gospel—the doctrine of Christian liberty—is fundamental to our spiritual growth; also that the opposition dogma—legalism—is a hindrance to growth. But first let us recall the struggle Christian liberty has had with legalism through the centuries.

Even at its beginning the New Covenant was attacked. In the apostolic age legalism had so disrupted the churches that it was necessary to call an emergency church convention to stop it. It later so gripped the Galatian churches that Paul had to use the whip: You frustrate the grace of God! You make Christ die in vain!

The "grievous wolves" were halted but not for long. They changed from the clothes of the Judaizers and put on the cassock of Catholicism. This time they were here to stay. Church-prescribed ritual crowded out the freedom of the Christian man and the laws of the higher morality undermined his Gospel of Grace.

The dark ages were darker because the New Covenant was no longer the law written in the hearts of men. Not until the Reformation was the doctrine of Christian liberty unearthed and reestablished in the dogma of the church. Luther championed the freedom of the Christian man. Not all the legalists were on the

side of Catholicism: In Zwingli, Calvin and Knox they put on the garb of Protestantism and succeeded again in forcing a religion of law down upon the heads of the people.

The most violent opponents of Jesus in His day were the religious legalists, the Pharisees. They hounded him with accusations that He was breaking their laws. When these saintly legalists ganged up with the not-so-saintly clergy of Jerusalem they sent Christ to the cross. After his battle with the legalists in the apostolic church Paul warned us all: "Be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage wherewith Christ has made us free." The Christian liberty of Luther was misunderstood even among his own following. It has never been a popular doctrine in the Protestant camp as a whole.

How can we explain this tremendous pull of legalism on religion? Ironically the legalistic banner is raised in the name of righteousness, and often with a crusading zeal. Those who oppose it (including Christ himself) are accused of opposing righteousness. This makes them appear to be riding Satan's bandwagon. The misrepresentation is even more ironical in that the legalist, as I will attempt to show, is really running away from righteousness, although of course he may not realize it.

The legalism that stands in opposition to the doctrine of Christian liberty substitutes outer righteousness for inner righteousness. There is security in making our goodness depend on a set of standards that we can follow by exercising our will-power—so much more security than when our goodness must depend on the stuff that makes up our soul. It is much easier for a strong-minded person to be a total abstainer from drink, tobacco, cards and the dance than to abstain from unkind thoughts or the desires of pride.

Since legalism's source is in the insecurity of the sensitive soul we can understand how transferring one's righteousness to the outside world would reduce this insecurity. We can also understand how this insecurity would be further reduced if great numbers of people would support this standard of righteousness. In numbers there is strength. It is good to see the masses going through the motions of our particular code of conduct. Because

the legalist needs this conformity for his security he is tempted to demand it when it is not forthcoming. When others continue to resist he may resort to strong language. If he goes to the extreme in defending his "way of salvation," he may warn his opponents that if they do not live as he does, they are going to go to hell!

In shifting the emphasis of Christian living from the inner man to the outer man the legalist is substituting what can be seen for what can not be seen. Jesus said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." He also said, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." The legalist has failed to fit himself between these two directives and has become a self-appointed judge of the "fruits." Since he has also taken it upon himself to decide what the fruits of Christian faith are, it is only natural that he selects fruits associated with the outer man. He concentrates on the body and overlooks the spirit (a carry-over from the old pagan idea that the soul is pure and the body, evil). So he splits himself in two, both philosophically and psychologically.

When Paul spoke of the sins of the flesh he meant the sinful nature of man as a whole, and in no sense did he equate flesh with body. Though the legalist may technically agree to this interpretation, he nevertheless thinks of the sins of the flesh primarily in terms of physical appetites and bodily habits. Consequently his attention is diverted from the depths to the surface, from the motive to the act, from the spiritual to the physical.

There are different kinds of legalists. We can divide them into two classes: one characterized by the nature of the laws observed, the other, by the temperament of the legalist. Each class has two groups. In the first class there is the group whose laws center chiefly around churchly rites, and the group whose laws refer more to the habits of personal living. The Pharisees had so many kinds of laws that they fit into both groups. Jesus said they strained at the gnat and swallowed the camel.

The legalism of the Judaizers of the apostolic age belongs primarily to the churchly-rites group, as would that of Catholicism for the rank and file of its membership. Monks, nuns and in some respects, priests, who in varying degrees withdraw from the world

and deny the desires of the body, would be legalists also in the personal habits group.

The legalism of Protestant Churches is concerned chiefly with the habits of personal living. Differing from the "higher morality" of Catholicism it does not require withdrawal from the world, sex, and the ownership of property. It seeks rather to purify society by much less stringent demands (and perhaps more superficial). Its most extreme demonstrations are the experiment of Calvin at Geneva and the Puritan society of early Massachusetts.

In the latter class (the temperament of the legalist) there is the aggressive legalist who demands conformity to his laws, and the submissive legalist who though wounded in spirit when others break his laws, suffers in silence. These latter are the people Paul calls the weaker brethren. In his day they were quite upset over Christians who were eating meat that had been offered to idols. Paul exhorts us to take care that we do not offend their sensitive consciences. The aggressive and submissive legalists may belong to either the churchly rite or personal habit type of legalism.

II

Freedom is something not everyone can handle. If we give too much freedom to our children they use it to their own hurt. But they are not afraid of it. For adults whose emotional life is still quite childish freedom may be as dangerous as for a child. Older persons, however, realize the danger, and actually fear freedom.

To stand alone, justified by something so intangible as faith, is frightening. I may in my varying moods wonder at times whether I have any faith, and hence whether I am truly a Christian. To complicate matters I am a sinner. Thoughts go through my mind I would like to disown; I am ashamed of the desires of my heart. I feel guilty. And now I am to be justified by the faith I do not feel I have; I feel even more guilty about this.

As with Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, so with all their children, when we feel guilty we become afraid. My freedom is responsible for my inner misery. Don't offer me more freedom! I want somebody to tell me what to do. (For the same reason peo-

ple may prefer a dictatorship to democracy.) Give me some rules I can follow to show I am a Christian and I will keep them, if for no better reason than to convince myself.

Who or what am I afraid of? Before whom do I feel guilty? Before myself? Yes; but where did I get the idea that I should be guilty? From my conscience. And behind my conscience?—God! I am really afraid of God.

If my God is a God of love can I be afraid of him? "There is no fear in love . . . for fear hath torments." (Torment—how I agree!) My God must be something other than love: Perhaps a mixture of love—and hate. What have I? A Devil-God?

"God is love." My picture of God therefore must be wrong. "God is faithful and just to forgive"—even my lack of faith. Evidently I do not believe this or I would be rid of my guilty conscience. Maybe my conscience is wrong!

While I have been professing to believe in the forgiveness of sins, my conscience has been stressing punishment for sins; while I have been saying I believed in the atonement of Christ for my sins, my conscience has been demanding that I make my own atonements. My conscience must be unregenerate.

It takes courage to be free. Nothing saps the courage from a man more than a guilty conscience. Nothing gives him courage more than a sense of forgiveness—of being at peace with God.

III

We have seen that the source of legalism lies in the insecurity of the sensitive soul. We have also seen that the source of this insecurity is an unregenerate conscience that fills the soul with guilt; the guilty soul is afraid and turns from freedom to bondage seeking security. So we see that the turn to legalism is the decision of an immature mind. We shall also see that continuing in legalism can lead only to further immaturity.

If legalism gave to the legalist the security he so desperately needs, we might conclude that he is as happy as is the free man. He may simply be arriving at the same goal by a different route. I think it can be shown that such is not the case.

The legalist has made it easy for himself at a terrible price. His course is one gigantic substitution of the tangible for the intangible. It proves in the end to be a snare rather than a substitute.

As we have seen, the legalist initiates the substitution-tangent by substituting (subconsciously of course) rules of conduct for faith. The substitution process once begun continues on in its own momentum. "Faith . . . worketh by love." When we substitute laws for faith we tend also to substitute a sense of duty for this love that grows out of faith. The legalist follows his laws to the letter. He is soon aware that others are not so conscientious, and it disturbs him.

If he allows it to undermine his certainty that he is on the right track, he is worse off than when he began. If on the other hand he can convince himself that he is still in the right and the multitude is wrong, he can go on. Naturally the latter is the more attractive.

Because the contrast between himself and others is a matter of keeping the rules, he is an easy prey for pride. Since he keeps them and they do not, he is the better Christian. He may not say this or even face it, for he remembers how the Pharisees talked. Nevertheless it comes out; he shows how he feels by the way he judges his fellowman.

The legalist is running away from his own guilt. He thinks he can escape it by keeping his laws; but it is still there. Somebody has to be punished. His substitution procedure goes another step. He may severely condemn those who break his laws. The emotional nature of his judgments gives him away; he is scapegoating. The stronger he condemns the more he is dealing out the punishment. There is a way to escape punishment. Unfortunately for the legalist, it is not by punishing our fellowman in our stead.

Legalism disrupts the communion of saints. By diluting the motive of love with the motive of duty it opens the way to misunderstandings and strife. It undercuts our democratic society which is founded upon tolerance and freedom. There is no tolerance where there is scapegoating. There is no freedom where laws

are ends in themselves; the temptation is too great to enforce conformity.

Legalists, though they are the weaker brethren, are often mistaken for the stronger brethren. Outwardly they are rigid and unbending. They speak with certainty. They rarely hesitate to point the finger. Because of these qualities they are often in positions of leadership in churches. They may even be feared because they condemn with such authority.

Their appearance of strength is an illusion. Churches which perpetuate the legalistic leader may prosper outwardly, but inwardly they will deteriorate, for they will have no genuinely spiritual leadership.

IV

In the language of Luther keeping the laws does not make a man good; rather it is the good man that does the good works. Christian liberty grows out of the forgiveness of sins. No freedom is possible until the basic freedom of all, the freedom from guilt, is experienced. The whole purpose of the Gospel is to bestow this freedom. God knows that every attempt a man makes to free himself from his guilt only tends to enslave him further. This freedom has to come by grace. Psychologically there is no other way.

We saw that legalism seeks to remove guilt by substituting outer righteousness for inner righteousness. The need for a substitute for our guilt goes beyond the legalist; it is shared by all people. It is so deeply imbedded in our personalities that in no other way—even by grace—can guilt be removed. God meets us where we are. Grace must come through substitution. "God hath provided a lamb"—a substitute; Christ is the propitiation for our sins.

We need a substitute in two ways: to take the punishment we know we deserve; and to provide the righteousness we know we lack. Christ meets both of these needs completely. On the cross he suffered even unto death the punishment for our sins; in his life, he lived to perfection the righteous life in our behalf. As we are freed by his cross from the burden of guilt, so we are freed by his life from the compulsion to be righteous ourselves.

By grace we are free. Pure and righteous, we can say with Luther we are free from all sins and free from all laws. We are God's free men—sons of his household. Secure within, we are free to be natural; no longer divided by inner conflict we can be ourselves.

Liberated at the source of our bondage we are also liberated from the enslavements that followed. Released from guilt, we also are released from the fear that followed. Guilt and fear cause tension. We carry this tension with us in everything we do. Like an ache or a pain it holds our attention; our thinking becomes centered around ourselves.

When by grace the hold of guilt is broken and we no longer have this tension, we are free to take interest in people outside ourselves. In short, our power to love that was heretofore pulled around ourselves, is released to find its objects in the outer world of other people. When love is the tie in interpersonal relationships, judging loses its motive and the back of pride is broken.

As we have the righteousness which is by faith we are freed from subservience to the righteousness which is primarily external. We need not preoccupy ourselves with the "seen"—the gnats—but can devote ourselves to the "unseen"—the camels. We can come to grips with our personality at its core—our inner world of motives. Christian liberty frees us from bondage to the non-essentials so that we can get down to business with the essentials.

When our righteousness is a gift we respond in gratitude to the giver. Through the New Covenant of grace the law is placed in our hearts. Our obedience to this law is directly motivated by our gratitude. It comes from the heart because it comes out of love; we obey because we honestly desire to obey. Our obedience is an integral part of the dynamics of our faith. "Faith worketh through love." The Christian man, as Luther put it, lives in Christ through faith and in his neighbor through love. Faith is his security; love is his power.

Christian liberty results from the mystical union with Christ. If it is not I that live but Christ who lives in me, then it is His influence in me that makes me want to do His will (which may not

be identical at all with the laws of the legalist). The freedom of the New Covenant releases our personality for growth and opens up the area into which it can grow. The results of freedom in a man's soul are the marks of maturity. To grow in grace means first of all to be freed by grace.

Our spiritual growth is a result of our union with Christ in which we become like Him from the core of our soul on out. We mature in proportion to the intimacy of this relationship. The mature personality is the unified personality, in contrast to the divided personality of the legalist. Spiritual growth is the integration of our spirit in Christ. Consequently the more we grow, the more integrated we become and the more liberty we enjoy.

Only a difference in the choice of a substitute makes the difference between a soul in bondage and one free to grow. Yet this choice, despite all verbal confession to the contrary, is the choice between justification by faith and justification by works.

Poems

Frances Swarbrick

WINDY DAY

All creation groaneth
and travaileth in pain
together. . . .

There seemed an anguish in the tree,
A torment in the fleeing cloud.
For something all the grasses sighed
And all the valley yearned aloud.

An oak tree bowed its tortured head,
The willows pitched and tossed and bent.
I sat upon the shuddering ground
And felt its tongueless discontent.

SELF-REALIZATION

I built a wall that I might grow
True to myself, alone and free.
Behind this shelter lush would glow
The rare and glorious bloom of me.

Too late, aghast, I saw my work
Was not a garden, but a cell.
And walled up with me in its murk
Was all of hell.

ASH WEDNESDAY

Tonight the yearning diapason sighs
Of some old organ bid my dull heart rise
To join again the summoned of the Lord
Where now the Feast is laid and wine is poured.

Now at this hour floats out upon the night
A solemn hymn, and candles bloom with light;
And prayers like incense to the heavens rise,
And hands are lifted up, the evening sacrifice.

Again in memory glows the cross of gold,
Amid the light and song I knew of old,
The violet damask and the scarlet wine,
The altar warm with flowers and candleshine.

The white fair-linen for the Feast is spread,
And He returned all-glorious from the dead
Holds out the Chalice to my lips unfit,
His Cup of Joy, "Come, drink ye all of it."

I hear again the haunting voices pray,
O Christ, Thou Lamb of God, That takest away
The sin of the world, have mercy upon us . . .
The organ murmurs, low, mysterious. . . .

Up through the dim, beamed roof to heaven's door
Well may their holy rapture soar.
The bounteous Spirit hears and peace imparts;
O Chosen of the Lord, lift up your hearts.

The Background of Lutheran Participation in the Ecumenical Movement

Stewart Herman

IN THE strong ecumenical current which in these years is riding at floodtide through the Protestant world and lapping high on the dykes of Greek and Russian Orthodoxy—yes, even on the walls of the Roman Catholic world—many observers would say that the Lutheran contribution is imperceptible. One answer to this might be that imperceptibility should be considered as a chief attribute of true ecumenicity. In this paper no attempt is made to catalogue all the major and minor contributions of Lutheranism to the ecumenical movement, but rather to describe the larger stream of our church and indicate the nature of its presence in the movement toward Christian unity, as well as the sort of influence it may be expected to exercise.

At times the Lutheran churches have been charged with being the least cooperative of all denominations. In view of what we believe to be considerable evidence to the contrary, this attitude seriously distresses us. We inquire, "Least cooperative in what respect?" If the ecumenical movement is defined—as it officially has been—as a drive toward Christian unity rather than toward church merger, the Lutherans are certainly in it. This includes, for example, membership in and support of the World Council of Churches and many other inter-church bodies, but it does not imply immediate marriage with other communions all over Europe, Asia and the United States. A similar reserve exists in other confessions which do not permit their loyalty to the ecumenical idea to be questioned.

There are other observers who have gained the impression that we Lutherans have been shrewdly damming up our stream—perhaps behind the coffer-wall of The Lutheran World Federa-

tion—for the deliberate purpose of releasing our collective pressure on the ecumenical movement, thus forcing it out of its "natural" bed into a Lutheran mill-race to grind Lutheran corn. Admittedly, there is always some danger of this—just as the danger of confessional exclusiveness is omnipresent—but is the danger greater in Lutheranism than in any other Christian world community? Which of us, when we contemplate moving into a new and larger house, does not relish the prospect of carrying some familiar furnishings from the old home? In discussing intra-Lutheran ecumenicity, I shall return to these points. "In my Father's house," said Jesus, "are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you." We must never forget that it is *he* who goes to prepare a place for *us!* All of us must be mindful that we do not go to prepare a place for him. Our task is to endeavor to understand his will as expressed in the Gospel, not only about the need for unity in the church but also about the nature of unity.

Three considerations—should they be called "distinctively Lutheran?"—must be kept in mind. For purpose of clarity, they have been given geographical names with a historical significance. The three heads are:

1. The Wartburg and Wittenberg
2. Stockholm to Utrecht
3. Lund and Amsterdam

THE WARTBURG AND WITTENBERG

The Reformation led by Martin Luther predated the modern ecumenical movement by nearly four centuries, but it deserves more than a passing reference if the basis of the Lutheran position today is to be understood. The Wartburg and Wittenberg were responsible for two characteristic qualities which are frequently found in Lutherans today: 1), a clearly-defined doctrine regarding the church, and 2), a tendency to distrust councils. They should not be casually brushed aside by non-Lutherans as a formal obeisance to confessional conformity. In the ecumenical movement the determined *churchliness* of Protestant Lutheranism

should not be underestimated. "Let the church be the church." Lutherans—like the Anglicans and Orthodox, for example—instinctively recoil against any reduction of the church to the approximate status of a social club, a humane society, a charitable agency, or an ecclesiastical corporation.

The Augsburg Confession of 1530, together with Luther's Small Catechism, forms the common denominator of all Lutheran bodies which otherwise in their manifold differences would make Joseph's coat of many colors look like a blue serge suit. Our essential doctrine of the church is found in Article VII, and our ecumenical attitude cannot be discussed without reference to it. We believe in one apostolic and Catholic church and we do not believe that it is co-terminous with the Lutheran church. We believe that the church exists wherever the Gospel is purely preached and the sacraments are rightly administered. We lay all emphasis on both the Word and the Sacraments; not the Word alone, nor the Sacraments alone, but on both.

We have tried to determine—upon the basis of the Gospel alone—just what the sacraments are and what they mean. We have consistently offered, as one of our Lutheran leaders today says, to sit down with any church and discuss union, yes, *union,* with nothing but an open Bible on the table before us. For example, as we understand it, our Lord is really present in his Supper. Many Protestants think that this need not be a stumbling block to union, especially as many Calvinists and Lutherans frequently come exceedingly close together in their attempt to meet this mystery in faith. But the day is not yet. The road of compromise does not lead to unity, any more than uniformity of liturgy, usages, or offices can produce true union.

At a very early date, Luther learned to be wary of councils and he had some very strong opinions on their competence. Above all, he resisted the idea that councils create new doctrines; they can only discover and denounce false doctrines. As early as 1520, he urged the calling of a general council to reform the church and in 1524 the German Diet at Nuremberg asked the Pope to act, but nothing happened until a preliminary call was sent out in 1536.

Further postponements followed and nothing happened till 1545 when the Roman Church gathered at Trent, not to discuss but to maintain the ecclesiastical pretensions of Rome. Meanwhile Luther prepared a treatise setting forth the proper function of councils, based on the early ecumenical assemblies. This treatise, like the Augsburg Confession, has entered into the modern Lutheran thinking.

Councils, he declared, serve no spiritual purpose if they are called to set a seal of approval on man-made doctrines. Basing his judgment on early church history and his experience of papal pretensions, he actually placed more faith in church councils which were summoned by secular authority than in those called by ecclesiastical potentates. At the same time he fully realized that princes were in special need of prayer because of the greater damage their positions enabled them to do. But the Church of Rome was too prone to place new and unnecessary creedal burdens on the shoulders of the faithful. He suspected that the hierarchy felt itself impelled to continue providing interesting novelties for a tired and disenchanted membership!

Consequently, Luther declared that the most effective councils were the congregations themselves, which were far more important than world assemblies. Councils can burn heretics, but only the local congregations can produce Christian men, real pastors, and faithful bishops.

It is not generally recognized that the order of the Lutheran church—despite certain exceptions—is strongly congregational. It is this innate independence of higher authority which has often prevented Lutherans from getting together with each other. Outsiders may not realize it, but isolation, where it exists, may be *intra*-Lutheran just as often as it is *extra*-Lutheran. The sense of "church" is strong, both in local organization and also in the conviction that we are members, not only of a denomination, but of a universal Christian community. In fact, the "denomination" as such has no intrinsic value. I do not know of any Lutherans, for example, who believe that The Lutheran World Federation is a church. Doctrinal doubts effectively deter at every stage the or-

ganization of anything like a super-congregation. Whether we regard it as a fault or a virtue, Luther had no talent for administrative organization and there is no evidence that he thought the Church of the Reformation needed it. We realize now that he left too much of this to secular authority, but my present point is that Lutherans are allergic to super-organization for the sake of organization.

This declaration may elicit some surprise in the minds of those who believe that they know the German church and believe that German Lutherans are the Lutheran archetype. This is not the time and place to begin a study of "comparative Lutheranism" but, after a considerable period of acquaintance with Germany, I have often wondered whether our non-Lutheran friends have not frequently confused German-ness with Lutheran-ness. The German people in general have developed a special talent for hierarchical organization and "Gründlichkeit," or thoroughness, which I have always found among the other German churches as well as among Lutherans. It seems clear that German political evolution for the last hundred years has strongly influenced religious evolution. We hope the trend will now be reversed, along with the tenacious tendency in many quarters to equate Lutheranism with Germany.

No doubt a word should be spoken about the organization of the United Lutheran Church in Germany and its significance for ecumenical progress both inside and outside the country. In the first place this Lutheran merger was not aided and abetted, as some think, by Lutheran leaders outside Germany. The Executive Committee of The Lutheran World Convention meeting in 1946 refused either to extend or withhold its blessing when its attention was drawn to the plans then being prepared. If the German Lutherans desired greater union, that was their internal affair. In the second place, the responsible German Lutheran leaders have never at any point considered this federation as a rival or substitute for the Evangelical Church in Germany. They want a united Protestant front, but they do not want another Prussian Union. Here again crops up the Lutheran aversion to an inadequate and non-confes-

sional church union masquerading at times in the plausible garments of cooperation and common Christian interest. Actual church union, they contend, is reserved for those who think alike on the *notae ecclesiae:* namely, the Word of God and the Sacraments.

STOCKHOLM TO UTRECHT

It may seem strange to emphasize these two cities rather than Lausanne or Edinburgh where the Faith and Order conferences took place. Stockholm has been chosen not so much as the scene of the Life and Work Conference in 1925—the first of the major post-war meetings leading up to the World Council of Churches—but because it was the center of Archbishop Söderblom's activity. His name without doubt is the biggest Lutheran name in the whole ecumenical movement and it is to be sincerely regretted that our church does not have more men of equal stature to place on the roll of honor with Archbishop Temple, John R. Mott, Bishop Brent, William Adams Brown and others of similarly decisive influence. Utrecht marks a milestone in the ecumenical movement because in 1938 the enlarged Committee of 14 met there to set up the World Council. What characterized the Lutheran contribution in this period?

Here again are two items worthy of special mention. First, Archbishop Söderblom himself and, secondly, the new inter-Lutheran ecumenicity. The two things are by no means contradictory, nor indicative—as some less charitable friends may secretly conclude—of schizophrenia. It must be remembered that Söderblom was present at the meetings of the Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach (1923) and Copenhagen (1929) which took place before and after the Stockholm Conference. According to the printed records, he did not find it necessary either to plead for greater interest in ecumenicity nor to protest against self-centered confessionalism. He welcomed the creation of the Convention.

There have been relatively few churchmen of outstanding ecumenical stature. Nathan Söderblom belongs to this select company. To him, according to Dr. Visser 't Hooft, goes the honor of making

the first definite proposal to create an "Ecumenical Council," namely, in 1919, at a meeting of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. Perhaps this honor could be claimed for several other churchmen. Not least on this roll, for instance, another Lutheran named S. S. Schmucker who helped to inspire the foundation of the Evangelical Alliance in 1846 and went on to urge something more than a voluntary union of individuals. The role of the Evangelical Alliance as a precursor of the World Council is very important and if you look into the printed report of that organization in 1873, you will find the specific proposal of Dr. Schmucker to transform the Alliance into an "Official Confederation." It might be of interest to determine whether a live link connects Schmucker with Söderblom at this point. The Evangelical Alliance tabled Schmucker's proposal as exceeding the competence of the Alliance and intruding upon the prerogatives of the churches!

Particular credit goes to the Swedish Lutheran archbishop for the persistence with which he pursued his vision of Christian unity during the dark days of the first World War. On several occasions, especially in October 1917, he tried to call a truly international meeting but succeeded only in attracting the neutral nations of the North. Before the Armistice was one year old, however, the ecumenical movement had gathered tremendous momentum in the World Alliance for Friendship. Söderblom's emphasis on cooperation in practical, tangible tasks facing the postwar churches bore fruit in the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work which rose to a glorious climax at Oxford in 1937, while the Conference on Faith and Order was making equally great strides toward Edinburgh in that same year. Lutherans were prominently engaged in both movements, though the Germans were gradually forced out after 1933 by political developments at home.

While this was going on, Lutheranism was developing a long-delayed ecumenicity within its world-wide fellowship. Although we constitute the largest Protestant community, no serious attempt had been made to mold these numerous churches into a

world congress. The Lambeth Conference, the Presbyterian Alliance, the international Methodist and Baptist bodies had long since organized themselves in their common interests and common tasks. The remarks of Lutheran leaders in the 1920's regarding the rapid international strides made by other denominations provide interesting reading in the light of more recent comments by some non-Lutherans on the creation of the Lutheran World Federation which occurred only two years ago. If the emergence of big international denominational bodies in the third and fourth quarters of the nineteenth century helped to blaze the ecumenical trail by reuniting large Christian families, can it not be contended that the belated evolution of Lutheran unity will serve the cause of ecumenicity in the same way? Many Lutherans think so.

It cannot be maintained that the founders of the Lutheran World Convention at Eisenach in 1923 entertained the same ecumenical thoughts that we do today. Can that be said of any church? But you will find in the LWC records the proposal, for example, of Pastor Ruppeldt—now Bishop of Slovakia—for the establishment of an "ecumenical council." You will find in all the various Convention reports the same faith, running like a golden thread, that there *is* one holy Catholic church, of which the Lutheran Church is only a part.

In March 1937, just prior to Oxford and Edinburgh, the Executive Committee of The Lutheran World Convention, after circularizing all member churches, released an important declaration on "Lutherans and Ecumenical Movements," which began with the sentence, "Ours is a day of enlarging relationships." The statement reaffirms the fact that "the Lutheran interpretation of the Gospel is not bound to incidentals, such as polity or liturgy or type of piety." No bones are made about the determined effort to engender a sense of Lutheran solidarity, but there were three strong, concluding recommendations concerning other ecclesiastical relationships: 1), that our churches should approach the general movements "in a spirit of catholicity without hostility or prejudice," but with due regard to genuine differences, 2), that Lutheran churches should agree among themselves as to united participation

or non-participation, 3), that certain basic principles should be observed. These principles still outline the usual basis of Lutheran cooperation. One of the most characteristic is that any general interdenominational organization should be constituted of *official* representatives of church bodies, and that it should engage only in matters within the proper sphere of the church. Here the essential *churchliness,* mentioned above, emerges again. The final recommendation is that the Lutheran churches of the world are urged to "maintain a united front in combatting militant ecclesiasticism" where it seeks "to oppress evangelical minorities."

LUND AND AMSTERDAM

Here again two points emerge: first, the alacrity of Lutherans to share in works of serving love, and, secondly, the significance of the confessional principle in the World Council. In the old Swedish cathedral town of Lund world Lutheran leaders met in 1947 to form the Lutheran World Federation. Like the Convention which it replaced, the Federation was a war-baby, born out of the urgent requirements of a world in flames and misery. Whereas Dr. John Morehead, because of his work as American Lutheran relief commissioner in Europe, was one of the central figures in forming the Convention, Dr. S. C. Michelfelder became a central figure in forming a Federation for the same reason.

The purposes of The Lutheran World Federation, which has no power to legislate for its members, are clearly defined in its constitution. These are:

(a) To bear united witness before the world to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the power of God for salvation;
(b) To cultivate unity of faith and confession among the Lutheran churches of the world;
(c) To promote fellowship and cooperation in study among Lutherans;
(d) To foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements;
(e) To develop a united Lutheran approach to responsibilities in missions and education; and
(f) To support Lutheran groups in need of spiritual or material aid.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Purpose (d), "To foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements" refers not alone to the World Council of Churches but to every Christian agency that exhibits a readiness to further the whole cause of Christ in accordance with the Gospel. The Lund Assembly put its conviction on record that one of the reasons for the division of the churches is human sin and that *all churches are called to repentance* and placed under *"a vital obligation to strive for the realization of unity."* There is nothing unusual or startling about these statements but it is extremely important to know that they are there.

So far as the work of post-war reconstruction and relief is concerned the Lutheran World Federation and most of its member churches are committed to a program of full cooperation with the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council. The Orphaned Missions project and the reconstruction work of these two great inter-church agencies have been substantially assisted by Lutheran World Action and Lutheran World Relief, to say nothing of increasing aid from Scandinavian sources. Lutheran representatives from America, by setting up their headquarters for relief administration in Geneva, in July 1945, served to draw European Lutherans toward the ecumenical center as embodied in the World Council of Churches.

Today there is a considerable *Service to Refugees,* of which I have the privilege to be European director. The reason for a considerable amount of direct action—which is *co*ordinated with other Christian agencies but not always *sub*ordinated to them—is perfectly simple. In the course of war, our Lutheran churches on the continent of Europe have suffered more extensively than any other Protestant churches and there is a direct responsibility to help them. In doing our share, a very large part of the general load will be lifted. We have been grateful to other churches which have helped us by helping our brethren, and on more than one occasion we have helped non-Lutheran churches. Without adequate first-aid the Lutheran churches stand to lose more than any other Protestant church. Think of the millions of Lutheran refugees, for example.

Finally, let us turn our thoughts to Amsterdam for a moment. It can safely be said that the Lutheran delegates, more than any others, approached the first World Assembly in 1948 with trepidation. They were torn between an ardent desire for a real Council of Churches and a firm determination not to be enticed away from their conviction that churches must be represented by official delegates and that—in the allocation of seats in the Assembly—churches should be grouped by confessional families rather than by regional areas. They were not ready to insist that *all* such groupings should be confessional if the churches themselves preferred some other arrangement, but the Lutherans asked for the same privilege which was already accorded to the Orthodox. In the preparatory conferences for Amsterdam the significance of the point was seen and it was decided to allocate representation in the Assembly neither to regional blocs nor to confessions, but simply to give each member church its due share of delegates and let them all group themselves as they saw fit. This was fair.

Although each world area unquestionably possesses certain regional and historical peculiarities of its own, it is apparent, after a second's thought, that geographical frontiers are far more artificial in religion than are confessional frontiers. In fact, the more we Christians insist on regathering by geographical groups, the more inevitably we tend to think in political terms. Ecumenicity certainly does not consist in leveling theological distinctions only to replace them with ideological concepts. Ecumenicity is more than ecclesiastical internationalism. No church has a treasure too precious to be offered to the one great Church of Christ, and no church can think of offering anything less than its true treasure. No man enters marriage seriously who gives his hand and throws his heart away.

Professor Schlink of Heidelberg in a penetrating article entitled "The Lutheran Dilemma" *(The Lutheran World Review)* pointed out very plainly the narrow road Lutherans must travel between the twin dangers of sacrificing purity of doctrine and, on the other hand, sacrificing a new promise of Christian fellowship.

It is in this dialectical tension that we must work out an ever larger participation in the ecumenical movement.

Two phrases have emerged with authority from Oxford and from Amsterdam: "Let the church be the church!"; "We intend to stay together!" The Lutheran churches wholeheartedly underscore these two statements in the present ecumenical setting.

The Lutheran Church in Russia

Edgars Kiploks

WHEN current political events turn our attention to Russia and the newspapers mention the losses caused by the red regime, let us remember one of them, the Lutheran Church in Russia.

Occasionally we have heard from objective sources about the continuing existence of an Orthodox Church in Russia and we rejoice that the Bolshevists could not destroy it completely in the thirty-three years of their reign. In contrast, the Lutheran Church in Russia must be considered as being destroyed completely. This is the situation in Soviet Russia as it was at the beginning of World War II (1939). The circumstances in the occupied Baltic States and Bessarabia (since 1944) of course are quite different and the Lutheran Church exists there, though with difficulty.

The destruction of the Lutheran Church in Russia was due in large part to its weak structure. That is: the Lutheran Church was not only a small minority and scattered in the huge area which comprises one-seventh of the whole world, but it was a typical church of foreigners without any influence on the Russians and without any possibilities for mission work among them. The Czars sheltered their people from any outside spiritual and political influences just as the Bolshevists are doing at the present. The policy of the Slavophils was to strengthen the position of the Orthodox Church and their efforts were supported especially by Alexander III (1881-1894) when the state enforced strictly the law: "no person born of Orthodox parents can ever change his religion." Besides, the influence of the Orthodox Church on the Russian nation was so great that the nation was really immunized from the other religions. It has been said that Russian and Orthodox are synonyms. In the matter of foreign missions the Orthodox Church was not very active but it was very influential in converting and Russifying the other nations living in the Russian empire (their

number is over 150). The Bolshevists now use the Orthodox Church as an instrument against the small nations; that is, the Bolshevists at present inspire the Orthodox mission among the Lutheran Latvians and Estonians and the Catholic Lithuanians in the occupied Baltic states. The same occurs in the Ukraine where now the Orthodox Church demands that the United Ukrainians return to the Orthodox Church.[1]

The fortifying of the Orthodox Church in the Russian nation is not only a historical process but a systematical work of the Czars, too. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in some places the influence of Roman Catholics and Protestants on the Russian nobles was remarkable but it never became a movement in the nation. Only in the Ukraine have both Western churches had better missionary success (this influence comes through Poland). The Russians are disposed to religious contemplation and enjoy ritualistic worship. The Czars in the eighteenth century were mostly indifferent in religious matters and were magnanimous in their treatment of foreign religions (e.g. Peter III planned reforms of an Evangelical character, Catherine II gave refuge to expelled Jesuits in 1773), but they supported the Orthodox Church because of political reasons, especially Nicholas I (1825-1855). In the nineteenth century there was a remarkable lay movement of evangelical revival character led by Col. Paskow and Count von Korf.

THE BEGINNING OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH

It is significant that the first Lutherans came to Russia as deported people. During the Livonian War in 1558 the Czar Ivan IV "the Terrible" (1530-1584) drove out the German Lutherans from the Baltic region especially from Tartu (Dorpat) and Narva. He located them in the suburb of Moscow. Among them were pastors. The relations between the Russians and the deported were not friendly; there are data about the destroying of Lutheran churches

1 They are Catholics with Greek ritual according to the Union of Brest-Litovsk, 1596. After the Polish revolution of 1830 in Russian Poland, they were pressed by the Czars to return to the Orthodox Church. Now the Bolshevists are finishing what the Czars once started.

by Russians (since 1580). Some Socinians, Mennonites, and Anabaptists also came and the Lutherans had many conflicts with them. When the French king Louis XIV in 1685 revoked the Edict of Nantes, Russia gave refuge to Huguenot families and the histories of both Protestant groups in Russia flowed together.

The gates opened wider for the Lutherans during the rule of Peter I the Great (1682-1725). In order to modernize his state he engaged foreign advisors. The state protected the Protestants by certain laws: a declaration of religious freedom for the foreigners (1702), a constitution for the Lutherans (1711), promises of financial support (1723). According to these laws the first Lutheran Church was organized which included ten congregations in different places: in M o s c o w, the oldest Lutheran Church in Russia, the St. Michael church; in S t. P e t e r s b u r g, which was established in 1703, the first Lutheran-Reformed church was founded the following year, and in 1730 the well known St. Peter Lutheran church (the city was renamed as Leningrad by Bolshevists); in N o v g o r o d (this well known merchants' place was always a bridge for foreign influences), in A r c h a n g e l, K a s a n, N i z h n i - N o v g o r o d (renamed Gorki), and A s t r a k h a n. The first leader of the Church was Superintendent Berthold Vagetius.

During the Great Northern War Russians imprisoned many Swedish soldiers, some of whom remained in Russia. Led by their Lutheran chaplains they established the Lutheran churches in Siberia (one at Tobolsk, for instance, in 1718). According to the treaty of Nystadt (1721), the Russians retained the Lutheran territories: the Finnish province of Vyborg (Viipuri) and the Baltic states. That opened the door to the German Baltic gentry for entrance into the high state official positions in Russia.

The politics of Peter I were continued by his successors. His second wife, Catherine I (1725-1727), was a Lutheran and a foster-child of the Baltic German pastor, Ernst Glück, who was deported during the war to Moscow where he organized Russian schools, compiled textbooks, and translated the Bible into Russian (the Orthodox Church uses the Bible in the Old Slavic language).

The greatest instigator in opening the Russian boundaries was Catherine II the Great (1762-1796) who was a daughter of the Lutheran prince of Anhalt-Zerbst. She favored the German settlement in South Russia with some privileges (dated July 22, 1763). In 1760-1761, 27,000 Germans settled around Samara (renamed Kuibyshev) and Saratov.

Since Peter I, most of the Russian emperors have had German and Danish Lutheran wives. The tutors of the heirs-apparent were mostly Evangelical foreigners. The higher state officials and officers also were almost all Evangelical foreigners. They were adventurous and religiously indifferent but were converted in order to help along their careers. The Lutherans thus held very high personal positions in Russia but had no influence on the mass of the nation.

Many new settlements were established after the Napoleonic wars when the Germans came to Bessarabia (which was incorporated into Rumania from 1918-1939), the Don-region, Crimea, Grusia, Transcaspia, etc. Similarly the industrialization of the state since the last quarter of the nineteenth century drew engineers, craftsmen, and merchants from Germany and Scandinavia to Russia. In connection with the unsettled agrarian conditions many Latvian and Estonian farmers from the Baltic provinces emigrated to the Interior Russia and Siberia. Later also engineers, teachers, and officials came from the Baltic region. Criminal, political, and religious deportations, discovery of gold, and the building of the great Siberian railway (from Moscow to Vladivostok, 1891-1905) brought thousands of Russians, Germans, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia. So during the nineteenth century many new Lutheran churches sprang up.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AND STATISTICS

In 1832 the state passed a law for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Russia which regulated its relation with the state and its inner affairs. The Church was placed under the General-Consistorium in St. Petersburg. Its president was a layman, and the

vice president was a pastor (General superintendent). Both were confirmed by the Czar. The other members were two laymen and two pastors confirmed by the Minister of the Interior. The General-Consistorium was under the Ministry of the Interior in administrative matters and under the Senate in jurisdiction. The General-synod in Russia's Czaristic time was never called to meet. The German Baltic gentry had a large influence.

Under the General-Consistorium were five regional consistories led by superintendents (elected by the regional synods and confirmed by the Czar). The regions were divided into the districts (German: *Propstei)* each with a district president *(Propst)* who was elected by the district pastors and confirmed by the regional superintendent. Every congregation had its president. The pastors were usually called by patrons or consistorium (in patronage churches) and were seldom elected by the board of the congregation (in independent parishes).

According to the statistics of 1904 which did not differ much from those of 1917 (when the Bolshevists came to power) the Lutheran Church in Russia, excluding Poland[2] but including the Baltic States and Bessarabia, had the following numbers:

Area of consistorium and residence	*Congregations*	*Churches and chapels*	*Ordained pastors*	*Members Children incl.*
PETERSBURG—Petersburg	113	429	126	799,748
MOSCOW—Moscow	72	287	84	454,912
Total in Interior Russia and Siberia	185	716	210	1,254,660
CURONIA[3]—Jelgava (Mitau)	129	227	140	659,291
LIVONIA—Riga	154	202	180	1,156,083
ESTONIA—Tallinn (Reval)	57	143	69	370,293
Total Baltic States	340	673	389	2,185,667
Grand Total	525	1,389	599	3,440,327
One pastor served on the average:				
in Interior Russia and Siberia		3.4		5,975
in Baltic States		1.7		5,619

2 The number of Lutherans in the Russian part of Poland was approximately 320,000.

3 Curonia (Courland) had nineteen congregations and twenty-three pastors under the Vitebsk Government which belonged only partly to the Baltic States (the Latgale, the Eastern part of Latvia).

The 1,254,660 Lutherans were divided among the nations approximately as follows:

Germans	900,000
Estonians	160,000
Finns	140,000
Latvians	50,000
Swedish, Armenians, Jews, etc.	2,000

The majority of Germans were in South Russia: in the Volga district (center Pokrovska, renamed as Engels by Bolshevists), in the Ukraine, the Caucasus, Don, and Crimean regions, and such large cities as: Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, Kharkov, and smaller groups in Central and North Russia. Estonians were also found in regions near Estonia (Government of St. Petersburg and Pskov), in St. Petersburg city, and in smaller groups in all parts of Russia. The Finns were predominantly in the regions north and northwest of St. Petersburg, and in St. Petersburg city. Latvians were in all parts of Russia and Siberia, as well as in St. Petersburg and Moscow. The Swedish were in St. Petersburg city and the Ukraine.

The congregations were of two types: the national (in St. Petersburg and settlements) which were organized according to nationality, and the international where the pastors preached in several languages, or in German, in case they didn't know any other. The Russian language was used very seldom in the church and only in the later days.

The form of service which was common to all and which was based on the Swedish of 1687 was edited for the last time in 1890. Each nation had a different hymn book; the Estonians, Finns, and Latvians used their own from the homeland, but the Germans had different editions according to their locations.

In the larger settlements, especially in the cities (St. Petersburg, Moscow, Odessa, Kiev, Khasan) there were large congregations (e.g. in St. Petersburg thirteen congregations with over 100,000 members) which supported confessional schools and inner mission institutions (very excellent ones in St. Petersburg; the

Petri and Anna schools, Sunday Schools, deaconess house, hospitals, libraries, etc.). But in some places the congregations only nominally served larger regions, for the pastors were not in a position to minister to them regularly. Such congregations had as their center the domiciles or homes of the pastors who visited the scattered groups as much as possible; the Lutherans came to them in case of necessities (marriage, baptism). The territory of the congregation at Irkutsk once was larger than Europe (3.4 million square miles) and the pastors were sometimes absent from their office for six months to make only one visit. Let us remember, that they could use the railways very little and usually went on horseback or by boat. The same conditions were prevalent in North Russia. Bishop Karl Chr. Ulmann (1793-1871) established a relief organization in 1859 *(Unterstützungskasse)* which raised in fifty years over 3,000,000 rubles, and so was able to give much help to the dispersed groups. In the army there were nineteen Lutheran chaplains. The church had two sailors' missionary stations abroad.

The Finnish congregations were served by the national pastors, the mixed groups mostly by Germans who knew something of the Estonian or Latvian language. Many Latvian and Estonian pastors worked in the German congregations because they could not find jobs in the homeland and because they were not favored by the Baltic gentry who usually had patronage over the churches.

The pastors had been educated in the State University of Tartu (Dorpat), established in 1802. Its Faculty of Theology was comparable to the best faculties in Germany. Such well known scholars as Adolf von Harnack and Reinhold Seeberg were alumni of Tartu. In the department of theology German was the language spoken.

In all places where it was possible the Lutheran Church organized private elementary schools and gymnasiums (comparable to our high schools). The Lutheran high schools in St. Petersburg were the best in Russia and under the influence of Wilhelm Löhe Lutheran deaconess houses and Evangelical hospitals were established which were more highly esteemed than the municipal ones.

The activities of the Inner Mission which aided those in need were remarkable. Since 1859 a Jewish mission had existed (the name of Pastor Rudolf Faltin at Kishinev was once well known). The Jewish population in Russia was over 3,000,000 belonging to the very strong orthodox group. The Lutheran Bible Society had existed since 1828. A special foreign mission had not been created but the Church supported the mission societies in Germany, Switzerland, and Sweden, especially the Leipzig Missions Society. There were some missionaries from Russia but not many. In general the Lutherans in Russia were of a conservative sort. Pietism was represented only in some settlements in South Russia.

The pietistic influence of Halle once was quite great but it touched only some circles (in St. Petersburg and the Baltic states). The pietistical activity of Mrs. Juliane von Krüdener (1764-1824) might be mentioned. She was a Baltic noblewoman who acquainted Alexander I with pietism and inspired the creation of the Holy Alliance in 1815.

Apocalyptical tendencies came to South Russia with some German settlers but didn't create dissensions in the Lutheran Church.

STATE AND THE CHURCH

Since the middle of the nineteenth century the Russian national movement (Slavophils) had as its motto: "One Czar, one tongue, one church," and opposed the abnormally large influence of non-Russians in the state administration and the army, as well as the minority nations. The program of this movement was realized under Alexander III (1881-1894) who appointed his tutor Constantine Pobiedonostcev (1827-1894) chief procurator (executive director) of the (Orthodox) Holy Synod. The Russian administration began to observe the law: "no person born of Orthodox parents can ever change his religion."

The persecution of the Lutheran Church was most effective in the Baltic provinces. There one-tenth of all Latvian and Estonian

Lutherans went over to the Orthodox Church in 1845-1848 in order to receive help from the Czar in their economic hardship. Afterwards they wanted to return to the Lutheran Church but the aforementioned law forbade it. The Lutheran pastors, however, motivated by the desire for freedom of religion, didn't respect this decree. Of 135 pastors in Livonia 105 were sentenced by the court. In addition the Lutheran Church was denied the right to supervise the education in the lower schools. The Lutheran Churches abroad sent protests against the persecutions and appealed for freedom but without results.

During World War I the State distrusted the Germans. Great numbers of German Lutherans, and their pastors as well, were banished to Siberia, or put under strict supervision of the police. The state intended to banish the entire German Volga river settlement but before the plan was carried out, the revolution of 1917 took place. In 1917 the Faculty of Theology in Tartu (Dorpat) was ordered to teach only in Russian; the German professors refused to do so and the students remained almost entirely without teachers. However, use of the German language in the services was permitted. The feeling against Lutherans in Interior Russia was intense because of the opinion that "German" and "Lutheran" were synonymous.

Because of banishments and evacuations from the Baltic provinces during World War I the number of Lutherans in Interior Russia and Siberia increased (since 1915 the Baltic provinces were gradually occupied by the German forces and the people were evacuated).

The relations between the Lutheran Church and the Russian state became worse when the Bolshevists took over the government (November 1917). The regime was against all Christian groups but especially against the non-Orthodox connections abroad. The Lutherans of course didn't agree with the Bolshevists and therefore paid with their blood in the civil war. German Lutheran settlements on the Volga river suffered greatly due to the

famine of 1921-1924.[4] In the first years after the revolution Russian borders were not so completely closed as now and many foreigners, gentry, and people with more means fled from Russia. According to the peace treaties, the Finns, Latvians, and Estonians were given opportunity to obtain citizenship in their respective states and to leave Russia. Some parts of Russian territory with Lutheran population were annexed to other countries (Bessarabia to Rumania, the frontier area of Baltic provinces to Estonia and Latvia). Poland became independent. The losses of the Lutheran population during the war, too, were high. Thus the number of Lutherans in Russia was reduced by approximately 350-400,000 people.

According to the Soviet-Nazi pact in 1939 the Germans in Russia could acquire German citizenship and return to Germany. This took another 170,000 Germans. After the German aggression in Russia in 1941 a bloody terror took the remaining. The Lutheran Church had been decimated again.

After the first revolution (March 1917) the Finns, Estonians, and Latvians had independence in their church life. The new national bishops were legally installed by the General superintendent Conrad Freifeldt. Instead of the old constitution the Lutheran Church devised a new one according to the decision of the Generalsynod on June 21-26, 1924. The Church was reorganized into thirteen German, one Estonian, one Finnish and one Latvian district. The district synods elected the synodical council, and the assembly of the congregations (Generalsynod) the Supreme Council. A Baltic German, A. T. Meyer of Moscow, was elected as the first bishop and A. Malmgren, a Finn of St. Petersburg, as his deputy. In 1924 there were about eighty-three educated pastors (for 850-900,000 Lutherans) who helped many volunteer workers. About

4 The Americans helped to overcome the famine and the Lutheran Church was cooperating in this action, too. The Chairman of the European Committee of National Lutheran Council, Dr. John A. Morehead, visited Russia in 1922. What he saw there has been summarized in his report dated February 25: "If Dante ever imagined a more horrible scene he failed to include it in his Divine Comedy" (cf. *John A. Morehead Who Created World Lutheranism,* by Samuel Trexler, page 92). The American church distributed not only food and clothing but gave spiritual encouragement to the Lutherans in Russia.

150 churches were holding services. The German Lutherans could publish their church paper. A seminary was established because Tartu (Dorpat) was now in the possession of Estonia. The head of this seminary was Bishop Malmgren and it was supported by the National Lutheran Council. In the first year (1924) it had thirty students; in the next, sixteen more.

The next years brought very hard times for the Church. The intra-party controversies and the opposition against the forced collectivization *(kolkhozi)* created a horrible terror against the Church, too. The motto was: "Destroy the kulaks" (that is, peasants on their own farms). A lot of people were banished to hard labor. The pastors were imprisoned, being accused of political activity. Thus the Lutheran settlements became disorganized and the people were filled with fear. Frequent meetings in which the population was forced to take part made the people exhausted. In such circumstances the people became indifferent to everything except survival. Those who have not been under the Bolshevists can not imagine the psychological influence of this terror.

Of course, on paper the Soviet constitution provided for freedom of religion and atheism as well,[5] but the opposition to religion was very general and persistent in harmony with the motto: "Religion is opium." Every religious expression was hindered by all possible means while atheism was supported by the state. The church buildings and other property of the Church were nationalized and for use of these properties rent had to be paid which was much higher than current rates, as was the case also with respect to obligatory insurance and rates for electricity. The church committee was jointly responsible for the exact payment. When the church could not pay or the state needed the church for other purposes the building was confiscated (on June 6, 1928, the famous St. Michael Lutheran Church in Moscow was closed). The pastor was considered as an unproductive element and therefore he had to pay a higher rent for his dwelling than other people. He was also

5 The Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Article 124 reads: "In order to ensure citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens."

excluded from the social institutions. Every religious activity outside the church building was forbidden.[6] Class instruction for children and young people in religion was forbidden by law.[7] Every teacher in Soviet schools had to be an active fighter for atheism. Atheism was propagated in all possible ways, especially in the regular meetings in factories and offices. Political screening by employment offices (which were usually led by party members) for jobs was a constant source of oppression to those who were church members and especially to those who served on church committees.

No one in Russia could be sure of not being accused as a counter-revolutionist or spy, and anyone could be sent to hard labor in the severe climate of North Russia and Siberia without any medical assistance. Therefore the banishment differed very little from the sentence of death. Human life isn't of much worth in Soviet Russia.

It is true that during World War II the Soviets changed their religious policy. The Bolshevists, like the Jesuits, are ready to use every means which can support their aims. Therefore they used religion for encouraging the people during the war and for foreign relations as well. But one must be suspicious of all news about the prospering of church life in Russia. Often this information comes from Bolshevist sources and many foreigners are confused in this way. The Cheka (secret police) have stolen into the Church too, using the same method as was used by Agamemnon against the Trojans.

6 The Law of April 8, 1929, Article 17: "Religious unions (parishes) are forbidden: (a) to establish mutual aid funds, cooperatives, producing unions, and in general to use the property at their disposal for any other purpose than the satisfying of religious needs; (b) to give material aid to their members; to organize either special meetings for children, youth, women, for prayer and other purposes, or general meetings, groups, circles, departments, biblical, literary, handworking, labor, religious study, etc., and also to organize excursions and children's playgrounds, to open libraries, reading rooms, to organize sanatoriums and medical aid. Only such books as are necessary for the performance of services are permitted to be kept in the church buildings and houses of prayer."

7 Criminal Code of U.S.S.R., Article 122: "The teaching of religious beliefs to infants or to adolescents in state or public educational institutions and schools, or breaking the rules established therefore, is punishable with correctional work for a period of one year."

However, I believe that the Christian spirit which has been within a nation for hundreds of years cannot be exterminated in a couple of decades and the terror of the Bolshevists only invites obstinacy. But we must realize that at the present time in Russia a generation which has grown up in this atheism is the leading element. We must realize this fact in case the Bolshevist regime should one day cease to exist. This generation will be our greatest missionary task. The statisticians usually estimate half of the Russian population as belonging to the Orthodox Church. That is too high, I think, and surely not half the Lutherans remain. Not only have a great number of the Lutherans been exterminated but those who do remain are of a much weaker character and are more easily subdued.

During the past twenty years we have not had any exact data on the activity of the Lutheran Church. There were no Lutherans from Russia at the third Lutheran World Convention at Paris in 1935 and they could not even send a written message.[8] At the end of thirteen years there were only four Lutheran pastors in the whole of Russia besides Bishop Malmgren. I have no reason to think that the Lutheran Church is any longer an organization.[9] Some day it will have to be re-established from the very bottom, gathering together the scattered people who were born of Lutheran parents.

However, since 1941 there has been a new type of Lutheran activity in Russia—the deported people from the Baltic states and the imprisoned German soldiers who kneel and pray to God in their despair. In exile and in the PW camps there is in fact an underground Lutheran Church very similar to the ancient church in the Roman catacombs. There are pastors, too: the deported ones and the imprisoned chaplains and students of theology. I am sure they are using each opportunity to serve this living congregation. There

8 During the famine of 1922 the Bolshevists did give some opportunity for the Lutheran Church to have contact with churches abroad (General superintendent Meyer was allowed to attend the first Lutheran World Convention at Eisenach in 1923), and to receive assistance.

9 Except in the occupied countries—the Baltic states, Bessarabia, and the Ukrainian territory which has been separated from Poland.

are martyrs among them and some day it will be possible to write a very interesting page of church history—a glorious one in the Lutheran Church.

I have met Lutherans who were, until 1941, in Russia. I am happy to state that they have a conviction that they belong not to the impious *bezboshniki* (Godless) but to an Evangelical church, and again are a part of it.

Some resolution between both parts of the world, Christian and un-Christian, is coming nearer and nearer. When it has been reached, the Christians will have the task of rebuilding a destroyed and paganized territory—a missionary task greater than ever before. I am sure the Lutheran Church will be active in this work, and then the Lutheran faith will again be proclaimed where it has been and still is so severely persecuted. Perhaps then it will have a larger influence than ever it had in the past.

The Theology of Einar Billing[1]

Gustav Wingren

A THOROUGH analysis of Billing's dramatic view of history is found in Ragnar Bring's work on the task of systematic theology,[2] although he limits himself to one tendency in Billing's writings, viz., to the metaphysics of the will. For our purpose it is sufficient to mention one reference which he makes to a specific problem in Billing's biblical theology. If reality is conceived of as will, and knowledge of this reality is attained only through what reveals man's will, then it lies close at hand to regard reality (even, ultimately, the divine reality) as indicated by the acts of man's will. The will, both the divine and the human, is one; and that which opposes this will is non-will. Only he who approaches the history of revelation from the point of view of will can comprehend its great perspective. It can also be said that whenever man has conceived of God as the highest will, the will becomes the center also in human life. This human will cannot *sincerely* will whatever it pleases. If it is to remain real will, it can will only what God wills. Bring points out that this conception of the divine will as an entity whose quality cannot be described by that to which it is opposed results in the well known tendency of Billing's biblical theology toward similarity, unity, and the absence of inner differences between the Old and the New Testaments, the prophets and Christianity. Since God works both in the Old and in the New, and since the divine will is a unity, the question about differences within the Bible cannot arise. The differences lie in the object of election: the people in the Old Testament, the individual in the New. The divine will is always one and identical.

1 The first part of this article (translated from the Swedish by Eric Wahlstrom) appeared in The Lutheran Quarterly for November, 1950.

2 R. Bring: *Till frågan om den systematiska teologiens uppgift,* I, 1933, pp. 130-158.

This whole development is a necessary result of Billing's philosophy of history. But it must also be maintained that Billing by means of this interpretation of history at many points correctly interprets the biblical material and clarifies many difficult passages. Thus he explains the inner development within the Old Testament in a very successful manner. His view of history and his conception of God as will are after all a correct interpretation of a unique feature of the biblical thought-world, which is objectively different from Hellenistic thought. Billing's approach becomes, therefore, exceedingly fruitful. But this general observation does not exclude the question of differences *within* the Bible. If, for instance, the Old Testament is understood as *promise* and the New Testament as the *fulfillment,* one would still remain within the sphere of biblical ideas presented by Billing, in which an historical *event* alone can be the point of departure for something new; while at the same time it thus becomes possible to indicate a difference between the Old and the New Testaments. The general concept of history is then removed from its key position in the center of biblical theology, and becomes instead the frame around the real content—Christ. More important, however, is another aspect of Billing's metaphysics of the will, viz., the marked absence of a distinction between law and gospel. We must consider this aspect of his theology also, before we leave his conception of history and take up his other great contribution, the conception of the church.

It may be said that for Luther law and gospel were two very different things, which man can never comprehend in a unity, even though they must be conceived of as being one in God. God's hiddenness implies that it is impossible to combine in human thought law and gospel as a unity; they must remain separated. This inescapable dualism is the foundation of both our theology and preaching even in this age. Billing, however, struggles with all his intensity to reach behind these two into the very unity of the divine will. This results in his prodigious effort to make everything in theology express one single idea, viz., the forgiveness of sin. Even in this constant effort to reach the unity of the divine will beyond law and gospel we discover the tendency of his metaphysics of the

will. We may, perhaps, venture to say that this complete unity found in the idea of the forgiveness of sin, which is Billing's theological achievement, is at the same time the weakness in his system. It is not really true that *everything* in Christianity is contained in the forgiveness of sin; and theological thinking ought not to strive after this unity. There is such a thing as *law,* and, however it is interpreted, it cannot without violence be transformed into gospel and forgiveness of sin.

It also becomes clear, therefore, that the conception of grace cannot remain pure and unequivocal if it is applied to material which does not belong to it. It must, so to speak, be merged with law into a unity of "grace and justice." The divine will is in Billing's thought always unitary and always the same, but is characterized also by a peculiar tension: at the same time demanding and giving. In its deepest reality it is grace and forgiveness, but it reveals itself as *merciful* only as the result of long theological brooding and patient "fashioning." All of Billing's works which are forged out of his view of history are characterized by this "mixed" grace, and this feature becomes most prominent in his conception of the call. It must be so when that which is law is forced to become an expression of forgiveness of sin.

To one concept, however, Billing's fundamental point of view, forgiveness of sin, can be applied without restrictions, viz., that of the *church.* The church is in reality gospel; the church is really forgiveness of sin. In a peculiar way the idea of justice loses its hold on Billing's thought as soon as he begins to expound his conception of the church. He presents grace so pure, so clear and unmixed, that one might very well distinguish his conception of the church from everything else in his theology. If his conception of history is one of Billing's original contributions, his conception of the church is the other. The latter of these is beyond any doubt the most valuable both from a theological and a practical point of view. The only caution which ought to be expressed here is that such a clear gospel as Billing presents in his development of the doctrine of the church demands an equally clear and simultaneous presentation of

law.[3] Billing, however, does not accept such a division of theology, as we have seen. Within the frame-work of his idea of the church the gospel alone appears with utmost clarity.

It is evident nevertheless that there are many connections between his idea of the church and his view of history. It is not necessary in this connection to reckon with the many statements that he makes as he looks back to the days of Ansgar when the Christian message first reached Sweden and to the subsequent time when the gospel permeated the life of the Swedish people. These are general reflections, resting on common observations of history, and there is nothing here of the specifically "prophetic" interpretation of history or any implied theological problems such as are found both in *The Ethical Conceptions* and in *The Atonement.* His peculiar conception of history, which may be called "the dramatic perspective," and which completely dominates certain parts of his theology, is something entirely different from mere historical presentations. This dramatic view of history plays no part, for instance, in his important work on the church, *The Swedish Folk Church,* 1930. In his address to the pastoral conference, 1937, published posthumously 1942 under the title "Church and State," his view of history does not appear at all. In one famous passage of his *Diocesan Letter* his view of history and his conception of the church are fused together. In most of his literary productions, however, these two conceptions remain separate entities.

In the literature dealing with Billing it is frequently emphasized that the idea of grace is primary in his conception of the church. If his view of history points back via Hjärne to the nineteenth century philosophical tendencies, the influence of Luther is even more apparent in Billing's conception of the church. In the literature dealing with Billing today it is striking how unanimously his theological contribution is regarded as having been made in the

3 The divine will which Billing delineates when he is governed by his conception of history represents both law and gospel, even though it is in *essence* only gospel. In his conception of the church, however, the gospel is without inner tensions; it is simply God's prevenient grace. Such an evangelical conception can be complemented by the idea of law and be incorporated into a larger perspective comprehending both law and gospel.

area of the doctrine of the church. In the book, *Einar Billing—In Memoriam,* the interest in this phase of his thought is very prominent, while his view of history receives relatively brief mention. This is the more remarkable when we realize that everything Billing has written about the church would make only a small booklet, while his writings on the conception of history would fill a considerable volume.

The immediate connection between grace and the church is everywhere present in Billing's thinking and is expressed most frequently when he explains the significance of infant baptism. Before man has even made an attempt at seeking Him, God has already in prevenient grace received him into communion. Grace is manifested in the very comprehensiveness which includes the whole people: "the forgiveness of sin, meant for all and offered to every one." In Billing's conception of the church the tension between judgment and grace disappears and is replaced by a clear conception of grace alone. There is no doubt but that in his conception of the church Billing approaches very closely to Luther, since to him the spiritual ministry or the church deals with the gospel, and the secular government is concerned with the law. "The whole church," as Luther says, "is full of forgiveness of sin." There is a close affinity between Billing's and Luther's conception of the church.

But there is found in Billing in addition a specifically *Swedish* element. Any unity of church and people could not be achieved in a confessionally divided Germany, either in Luther's day or in the present. As soon as Billing leaves the field of speculation and thinks about a concrete church, it is always the Church of Sweden which is the object of his thought. Sweden in the sixteenth century and especially the Diet of Uppsala occupy a very important place in his idea of the church. The result is that, in spite of the fact that he is dependent on Luther, his conception of the church is a new creation, not a copy of Luther's. It is a new conception which ought to be preserved and is capable of further development.

During more recent times the tendencies in the Swedish church have been to some extent away from Billing and partly in opposition to the folk church idea. Even the high-churchly tendency is

more dependent upon the churchly renaissance early in this century than its adherents realize. Its independence over against this movement[4] has often been won through adherence to foreign patterns. Due to the ascendency of the high-churchly tendency "the Young Church Movement" which was connected with the young people at the beginning of the century has lost its lustre. In a derogatory sense it may now be associated with any pastor who is a little careless about his duties, but yet gives some attention to a young people's group with some connection with the earlier movement. Such "parish service" is then taken as a legitimate expression of Billing's ideal of the folk church, even though this pastor may never have read anything of Billing's writings about the church. Most of that which today goes under the name of "the Young Church Movement" has nothing to do with Billing and his conception of the church. Quite often it represents the opposite of what Billing wanted to accomplish, and results in a departure from the territorial parish idea rather than making this the center of all church effort. On the other hand, it can be said that much of what is now called "high church" can be incorporated under Billing's conception of the church; especially is this true of his appreciation of the liturgical element and his endeavor to give to the sacraments a central place in the church. But Billing found it also necessary to reject all suggestions about the hierarchical nature of the ministry. He declares often that an emphasis on *successio apostolica* leads away from a right conception of the church. In this stand he has the support of both the Reformation and the Church of Sweden.

The concept of the church has been the concern of theology also during recent decades. The object has been, at least in Sweden, to emphasize the continuous line of development from Billing's contribution to the reorientation of the present. Nevertheless it seems that even in theology it is easy to fall into a half-Romanized

4 During the first decade of the twentieth century a churchly renaissance swept over the Swedish church. Its emphasis was on the church as the center of the people's life, and it appealed especially to young people. Its ideal was the folk church, "the whole people of Sweden—God's people." This movement is commonly referred to as "the Young Church Movement." Billing became its great theologian, Söderblom (later archbishop) its inspirational leader, and J. A. Eklund its hymn and song writer. (Transl.)

position, where it is not clearly affirmed that the church is founded on the Word and that the place where the Word is active is the geographical parish: the local parish with its church and customary worship service. The confusion in this respect is increased by the almost excessive emphasis among practical churchmen on the organization of the voluntary work of the congregations on a national level. In this way there emerges the image of the Swedish church as an independent body whose relation to the local parishes is very unclear and whose center is somewhere in Stockholm: a church which is, on the one hand, similar to the Roman Catholic with its *Curia* in Rome, and, on the other hand, a Swedish free church with voluntary membership and with the annual synod as its spiritual climax. In reality, when the idea of the Word creating the church is taken seriously, it destroys both the Roman and the sectarian conceptions of the church. The Word is active primarily in the local congregation where law and gospel are proclaimed, and the purpose is to reach all the people within the geographical boundaries of the territorial parish as a whole, not in order to separate them from this parish, but to help them live correctly in their calling. Without any reservation we can make the following assertion: if *any other* organizational idea than that of the geographical parish is central to the conception of the church, it is impossible to make the Word central in such a conception.

The local congregation (the geographical area) is the center of Billing's conception of the church. When we hear the word "folk church," we generally think in terms of a people, the realm, the nation; and it is true that this national implication can be found also in Billing. From one point of view, which is seldom recognized or emphasized, this represents a valuable element for the ecumenical relationship of our church. The realization that our own church has a national character provides a sound ecumenical attitude toward churches marked by the characteristic of other peoples; while judgments based purely on confessional grounds tend to confuse and excessively divide. But to Billing the folk church is nothing else than the sum total of all the local parishes. It is with the local congregations (as geographical units), not with the na-

tional organization, that Billing concerns himself in his theological analysis of the conception of the church.

It is typical that Billing could see no difference between the conception of the church and the "idea of the congregation" as developed somewhat earlier in Uppsala by J. A. Eklund. The congregation and the church are after all identical.[5] From a systematic point of view the congregational idea and the folk church become one. Consequently Billing loves to begin with the parish church when he develops his conception of the church. In his confirmation instruction about the significance of the church the pastor is to start with the church in his own parish. The bells of the church invite every one to come, and in the last analysis the message is the same for every inhabitant of the parish. According to Billing's *Diocesan Letter* the parish pastor must never make any distinction between the administrative district in which he as a servant of the state keeps books and compiles statistics, and the spiritual realm which he calls *his* parish for which he is responsible to the Lord. To be sure, he cannot reach every one in the same way and he cannot be equally close to all, but he must strive toward this ideal and regard close association with a more intimate group as a temptation that is to be resisted.

The most important document relative to Billing's conception of the church is *The Swedish Folk Church,* 1930. One of the chapters is entitled "The Local Congregation—A Congregation of God." It is evident that the local congregation is here the central concept. The local congregation is, according to Billing, a geographical parish, made up of all the people who dwell within a clearly defined area and are in this sense a congregation of God. Billing maintains that the subject in the activity of the church is God, not man. "If we take seriously the insight that not man but God is the essential 'subject' of the church and the church His instrument, while man is the 'object' of His grace, then in a moment

5 "Take all of Sweden's local parishes together instead of one at a time; take the boundaries and the population of the whole country, and apply the same religious point of view to the whole as to the parts, then there emerges the religiously motivated folk church and the ideal: the Swedish people, a people of God." From a statement of Billing in 1926.

everything is changed." "God would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." Here is something which after all the whole population has in common. They are encircled alike by the geographical boundaries and by God's universal will to save. In view of this supreme certainty even those differences and contradictions which from other points of view appear of great importance become immaterial. Not every one seeks God, but God seeks them all. He has begun this search long before they were able to seek him; and He does not cease because they stop. As His forgiveness awaits even the one who has gone farthest astray, so the most accomplished saint has nothing in which he may trust except this same forgiveness. This whole heterogeneous population which lives within the confines of the geographical boundaries of the parish are all sinners whom God never tires of forgiving.

The chief significance in the expression, "the church is the forgiveness of sin," is that the parish church with its message is the forgiveness of sin to the geographical parish. The church offers the forgiveness of sin on behalf of God to the whole congregation. Because she belongs to all, she is herself a witness to the grace of God. Even the congregational register which contains all the names is a part of this witness. By extending the idea of the territorial parish we arrive at the concept of the folk church, or to the simple plural, the territorial parishes. This plural form, according to Billing, however unpoetic, expresses even better than the term, folk church, the idea of God's prevenient grace.

The most important chapter, however, is the lecture on "The Folk Church and Preaching," which is Chapter I in *The Swedish Folk Church*. Here it is even more clear that the idea of the folk church is identical with the local parish and that Billing's starting point is always the parish church. The idea of the church is here developed under the guise of a parish pastor's thinking about his geographically defined parish. Often it is the parish church which guides the pastor's thoughts aright when he is in danger of losing sight of the gospel. Even the parish pastor will profit by listening to the sermon which the parish church and its congregation delivers to him. They teach him that the basis of his own position is to be

found in this alone that he has been called to proclaim God's message of the forgiveness of sin. In general we may say that in *The Swedish Folk Church* the geographical parish is a more central concept than the folk church.

Einar Billing himself was not conscious of any contradiction between the geographical parish and the folk church. He regarded favorably the formation of national organizations for the direction of the voluntary work within the church. But if the idea of the folk church is separated from the concept of the local parish and becomes identified with the national organization, then we have turned away from Billing's conception of the church and entered an entirely different world of ideas. Then we have to think of Sweden as divided into movements, parties, and groups differing in ideology, emphasis and world view, which the church then has to meet and deal with in presenting the gospel. There is then no longer any possibility of the *Word* being the foundation of the church, for in this case the Christian *view of life* becomes the constitutive factor. The conception of the church which rests on the Word deals with geographical areas, territorial parishes with parish names, and with *people* who live within these areas; people who have tasks, callings, and homes; people who are sinners, but nevertheless called by God's grace, both by the gospel and the disciplinary law; people whom it would be meaningless to divide up into groups according to their opinions. Billing's thinking about the church goes in this direction, even though his romantic conception of the call introduces a certain spiritualism also into his conception of the church.

According to Billing nothing must be equated with the local parishes except such adjuncts serve the interests of the parish. It is out there in the multitude of parishes that the destiny of the church in Sweden is determined, and the future of our folk church depends upon the spiritual life in these parishes. This future destiny is not decided in the national diet or in the church conventions, but among the local parishes, depending on how successfully they are able to maintain their right to be called "God's parishes." If such a reminder was necessary when it was long ago voiced by Einar Billing, it may be wholesome to repeat it even today.

Notes and Studies

THE WEIMAR EDITION OF LUTHER'S WORKS[1]

R. Jauernig

The *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* of April 30, 1950, reported on the meeting of the Conference of Bishops and of the administration of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany at Hannover, April 13 and 14: "Finally, it was decided that the UELC of Germany would take an active part in bringing to a conclusion the great Weimar edition of Luther's Works which was begun in 1883 on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of Luther's birth and of which 90 volumes have now appeared."

The significance of this resolution is understood only by those who know the history of this critical and complete edition of the works of Martin Luther and especially by those who were acquainted with the events of its earliest period. The above mentioned resolution seems, humanly speaking, to guarantee the continuation and completion of this immense project. It brings, also, a great relief to those who in any way have had a part or merely an interest in this work. A word of thanks is therefore in order in this place and in the form of a reminder of the history of this Luther edition.

The credit for the plan and for its execution despite all kinds of difficulty belongs to Joachim Karl Friedrich Knaake. Without his enthusiasm, sacrificial spirit, persistent industry, learning and tenacity, this great scholarly Luther edition would not have come into being. He was born in 1835, at Werben in Mark Brandenburg, studied in Berlin on an electoral scholarship, and remaining here after his examination to make a living as a tutor, continued his studies and worked in the Royal Library. He took his second ex-

1 This informative article on the present status of the great *Weimar Edition* is a translation by the editor from the Sept. 30, 1950, number of the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (Munich).

amination after attending the pastoral seminar at Magdeburg and between Easter 1862 and St. Michael's Day 1863 taught science at the gymnasium at Salzwedel. He was ordained and served as assistant pastor at Eichsfeld, and at the beginning of 1865 became chaplain of the Cadet corps in Potsdam. In 1881, when the Luther edition was assured, he moved to the small parish of Drakenstedt, near Magdeburg, in order to be able to devote himself more intensively to his academic work than had been possible in Potsdam. He retired in 1901, on account of poor health, and died in Naumburg (Saale) on April 6, 1905, almost to the day a half year before his 70th birthday. Knaake himself gave a brief story of the origins of the Weimar edition in its first volume (pages XV-XXII), and Otto Albrecht elaborated on it, citing the pertinent source material, in his *Lutherstudien zur 4 Jahrhundertfeier der Reformation veröffentlicht von den Mitarbeitern der Weimarer Lutherausgabe, Weimar, 1917* (Luther Studies published by the coeditors of the Weimar Luther Edition on the Four Hundredth Anniversary of the Reformation). Over and beyond this I have had access to many handwritten materials from the literary remains of Buchwald and Otto Clemen.

As early as 1880 Knaake had conceived the plan of a scientific edition of Luther inasmuch as the Frankfurt-Erlanger edition was manifestly inadequate. Julius Köstlin had experienced the need and encouraged Knaake, who on August 3, 1880, addressed his first attempt to the royal Prussian Minister of State for Affairs of Church, Education and Medicine, von Puttkamer and to the councillor in this ministry, Prof. Bernhard Weiss, and a few days later also to the supreme consistory in Berlin. Replying to an inquiry of the Minister, Knaake presented his plan on Sept. 22, 1880. He believed it would not take more than thirty-six to forty volumes in large octavo, each volume comprising forty-five to fifty forms, to contain the works, sermons, etc. of Luther. A financial subsidy would be necessary because at least to begin with the publisher would not be able to meet his outlay from the sale of the work, nor could he, because of the great financial risk, undertake further volumes which would involve honoraria and the obtaining of source

materials. The Minister turned to the Royal Academy of Sciences in Berlin asking for its opinion. This was forthcoming on the 18 of December 1880 and except for some objections which at least in part were due to misunderstanding declared that the Academy could not strongly enough recommend the plan of Knaake and the requested aid. The opinion was signed by du Bois-Reymont, Curtius, Mommsen and Auwers. Prof. Julius Köstlin of Halle, prompted by Weiss, also put in a strong and timely word for Knaake and his proposition in his letter of December 27, 1880, to the Minister. The finance ministry presented the final obstacle, on account of the annual amounts of 4,000 marks for ten years which were requested, but Kaiser Wilhelm I himself overcame this on the personal appeal of court preacher Kögel. The execution of the plan was assured by the consent of the Finance Minister on April 14, 1881, as Kögel informed Köstlin who immediately conveyed the news to Knaake. The permission of the Kaiser, given on May 4, 1881, and countersigned by Bitter and Puttkamer, granted from funds at the disposal of the Kaiser the sum of 40,000 marks in ten annual payments, as a "subsidy to the complete edition of Luther's Works to be undertaken by Pastor Knaake." In his letter to Knaake the Finance Minister made the proviso that the publication should begin with volume one in the year 1883 and barring unforeseen hindrances should be completed within ten years. Not even all the 40,000 marks were allocated to the Luther edition—the business-like Finance Minister Bitter assigned 7,500 marks for the purchase by the present Royal Library of Knaake's Luther collection, containing over 2,000 items, some very rare, and made this sale by Knaake one of the inflexible conditions for the execution of his plan. That he did not sign the sale-and-loan-contract with the Treasury until May 9, 1885, reveals how reluctant he was to part with the collection which he had gathered over a period of twenty years and at great personal sacrifice. He had paid for it by the extra teaching he had done, even to the point of exhaustion, while serving as Cadet chaplain, and by the other privations to which he had subjected himself.

The first stipulation was fulfilled—volume one of the new edi-

tion appeared before the quadri-centennial of Luther's birthday. The Foreword is dated September 1883. Shortly before the theological faculty of the University of Halle had granted him an honorary doctorate, originally intended for bestowal on November 10, but as the Dean wrote, it was the faculty's wish "that the first volume of the monument which you have begun to erect to the honor of the greatest doctor and professor of theology of the united Wittenberg-Halle University should not see the light of day before the honorary doctor's title might be added to the name of the man who had made himself so highly deserved of it through his Luther work." It was indeed no advance laurel tribute thus paid Knaake. He had published as early as 1863 his first scientific production, "Luther's Contribution to the Augsburg Confession," an elaboration of a work presented for his first examination. He went on to researches in texts and sources of Reformation history, sifted critically the materials for a scientific treatment of the life of Martin Luther, and in this connection reviewed the more important publications about Luther and his times, including Köstlin's biography of Luther (1 Edition 1875). Thus he had already proved his scholarly qualifications by this long list of productions, and the Berlin Academy of Sciences had officially designated him as the proper man for the proposed undertaking, before Halle expressed its recognition of his learned achievements and its gratitude for his foundation of the monument in honor of the great Reformer.

But the second stipulation could not be met. Unforeseen hindrances did in fact arise to make altogether impossible the finishing of the Weimar Edition within ten years. In his first letter to the Minister of Culture Knaake appealed to a statement of the Church historian Karl Haase of Jena who wrote in his *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* 1858 (8 Ed. p. XXIII) that he hoped for "an edition of the works of Luther which even in its form would be as worthy a national monument as was the Cathedral of Cologne." But on this cathedral generations had been building! At first Knaake seems to have thought of preparing and producing the Luther work by himself. But at that time he as little as the academic advisors of the ministry realized the scope of the under-

taking, what tedious preparatory studies would first have to be completed, what an innumerable mass of genuine and spurious manuscripts of Luther had first to be verified and then critically used—materials such as prints and reprints, extracts and copies of Luther writings, table talk, letters, sermons and lectures, which lay hidden as unknown treasure in German and foreign libraries and archives. One need only turn to volume 35 of the *Works* to learn that on this one volume, dealing with Luther's songs, seventeen years of labor were expended including years of war and inflation. After eleven years, in 1917, twenty signatures were already printed, but as the editor W. Lucke informs us, it then proved well-nigh impossible, on account of gaps in the second part to proceed to the texts and melodies. Lucke was assisted by Johannes Luther, librarian, and H. J. Moser as music historian. Even after the volume was finished in 1923 it was necessary for Lucke, Albrecht and Drescher to supplement the work with "Additions," "Appendix and Corrections," and later "Additional Appendices and Corrections." Granted that this is the extreme example in the whole edition it yet shows that the work of one man or one decade was not sufficient to fulfill the promise of the prospectus—to pay "Evangelical Germany's debt of honor," and to erect in all its glory the memorial to Luther which he himself established in his living word.

The Ministry set up a commission and ordered Knaake to report to it constantly on his work and to reach agreement with it on all necessary projects. It was natural that Knaake felt that such a Commission meant a restriction of both his academic freedom and his freedom of movement, a sort of control agency, since he had to first obtain from it the money he needed for any journey, secure its consent for any contract to be made with the publishers, and, finally, fight out with it the scientific principles which were to govern the edition of Luther's works. In actual practice this arrangement complicated the task and threatened even the scientific character of it. A word should be said here about the basic principles of the Edition. Knaake held to the rule of most strictly preserving the original text, even to the point of an obvious mistake in punctuation. He had come to this principle and had maintained

it in his earlier academic works. The Commission, at least in part, was of another opinion. Knaake was able to carry through, as against Müllenhoff, at least the principles announced in volume one, page XIXf. which represented an unhappy compromise and were not at all satisfactory. These were changed later, but were still substantially different, though not without some reasons, from the "Principles of presenting the text in the publishing of the sources of modern history" (most recent statement München, 1931). It was not until Köstlin became a member of the Commission (1884) that it acknowledged its duty to cooperate in, advance and assist the great project so that it might succeed and be concluded in the foreseeable future.

On the request of the minister the Academy of Sciences named Müllenhoff and Waitz as members, the minister appointed Prof. Bernhard Weiss as chairman, and Knaake was the fourth member. There were thus two philologists and two theologians, and the first meeting was held on June 21, 1881. But no philologist had participated in the preparation of the first volume, a fact which the critics later pointed out and deplored. The membership, however, soon changed. Köstlin was called in as an advisor as early as 1882, and in 1884 he became a member of the Commission. Apparently the arrangement lasted until 1917 and the proportion of three theologians and two philologists on the "Commission for the publication of the works of Martin Luther" was probably dictated by the consideration that the greater part of the task belonged to the field of theology and church history. The chairman was appointed by the Prussian Minister of Culture who represented the subsidizing agency, but after constituting itself the Commission enlarged itself constantly without asking the Ministry. It is of interest that those who did the greatest amount of scholarly work were not members of the Commission, as Otto Clemen, who appears as a co-worker in 1907 and since 1930 in a tempo remarkable for his age produced the eleven volumes of *Letters,* and George Buchwald, who had a large part in the publication ever since 1886, editing especially a great part of Luther's sermons and disputations and creating the comprehensive card catalogue which was the source

of the first three indices in volume 58 of the *Works*. The rest of the indices will gradually be completed in my office, beginning with the most exhaustive, the subject and theological index. Neither the Academy nor the Ministry has exercised influence over the Commission. When the Ministry undertook to inquire of the Commission why a Weimar and not any Berlin publisher was being considered, the Commission pointed out that the Luther edition was a private undertaking and only subsidized by the government.

Reviewing the stately rows of the volumes of the Weimar edition we may assert that a great number of eminent scholars, especially philologists and theologians, cooperated in it, most of them to the end of their lives. Surviving is only the publishing firm, Hermann Böhlau (later Hermann Böhlau's successor) in Weimar, with which Knaake signed a contract on July 5, 1882. "In points with which it was concerned" the Commission gave its endorsement. Noteworthy is the fact that the contract was submitted to the Minister of Culture for his approval despite the previously described legal standing of the Commission. The accomplishment of the printing firm is marvelous. From the appearance of volume one on the editors of the Work have time and again expressed highest praise and most grateful recognition to the firm.

Knaake's estimate of possibly thirty to forty volumes has been substantially exceeded. Also the original plan of dividing the edition chronologically into three parts, namely the writings before 1521, to 1530, and the rest, was not carried out. The whole work took on the title of *Critical Complete Works* and assumed a four-fold division: *Works, Table Talks, The German Bible,* and *Letters*. The *Table Talk* in six volumes (with an index in volume 6) was edited chiefly by Kroker and finished in 1921. However, additional material and supplements became necessary—these found a place in volume 48 of the *Works*. Clemen alone edited the entire eleven volumes of *Letters*, which still lack an index, though America has provided the first draft of an index of Bible passages and of references to classical writers and the Church fathers. When this index is completed it will have a value even greater than that of the other divisional indices because of the significance of the *Letters* also for

secular historians. *The German Bible* will include twelve volumes —the first seven and part one of volume 9 have appeared. Unfortunately the scholarly lady assistant who with great industriousness and wide learning was in charge of this work under the direction of Professor Bebermeyer, recently passed away after a long illness. The larger part of the Edition consists finally of the *Works*. These include volumes 1 to 54, 56 and 57, and, after 1945, volume 58, Part I with the three indices of the *Works,* the *Table Talk,* and *The Bible*. Volumes 17, 31, 34 and 39 each are in two parts, 30 and 40 are in three parts, volume 40 has an unnumbered supplement in the form of a word and subject index, and volume 10 appeared in three parts of which the first part consisted of two sections. Altogether thus the *Works* count up to sixty-nine volumes. Adding the six volumes of *Table Talk,* the eleven of the *Letters* and eight of the *Bible*, we get the impressive total of ninety-four volumes. Most of them run to 650-750 pages, including prefaces and occasional indices. The smallest number of pages is in volume 11 of the *Letters,* which has 349 pages, and volume 39 of the *Works*, with its 520 pages. The largest volumes are the 928 pages of volume 47 of the *Works* and the 1,059 pages of volume 4 of the *German Bible*. Volume 58 Part I of the *Works* consisting of 322 pages, according to the notice on the second title page, will soon be completed.

It is a glorious tribute to German research and learning that these ninety-four volumes could appear in sixty-seven years, but also a brilliant achievement of the publishing house. These years included ten years of war, while the inflation following the first World War, and the closing of the banks and the currency reform after the second World War obstructed and crippled the work of scholars and publishers. Although the firm lost money, machines, and printed forms on account of the political catastrophes in 1945, it still was able to bring out volume 10 of the *Letters* in 1947. Volume 11 of the *Letters* and volume 58 Part I followed in 1948, thanks to a financial grant solicited by myself from the Lutheran Church of Germany but unfortunately reduced greatly in value by the currency reform.

When the committee on archives of the Evangelical Church of Germany entrusted to myself as church archivist a number of important ecclesiastical and historical projects and duties, it meant also a close concern for the finishing of the Weimar Edition. Political developments have eliminated Prussia, which had continued as patron even after the ten years of the original agreement and had been the main source of income for the scholarly preparation and fashioning of the Luther edition. Completed manuscripts have been printed. On hand from the papers of Buchwald was the above mentioned Index, in galley proof for the first two letters, otherwise in card catalogue form. It was found necessary to go over Indices 4-7 with regard to form, style and type, to abbreviate where possible and to check references. There is a great demand for the Index without which it is difficult to use the Weimar work. This task is comprehensive and complicated and there was not money for it. Furthermore the Commission was no longer functioning. The government's representative, Prof. Erich Seeberg, was dead, another member was advanced in age, the head of the enterprise very sick. This led to my decision to place before the administrative council of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany the whole problem of the future of the Luther Edition, seeking to launch again the leaky vessel and bringing it, not into an emergency port, but to its own goal. The petition of September 30, 1949, led to discussions and negotiations and to the decision that the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany will assist in the completion of the Luther Edition. This action will everywhere be hailed with joy. The thanks of all who love Luther are due to the administrative council and especially to Bishop Meiser who has given the project his full support and in a masterful way has overcome the obstacles which arose. The Lutheran Church of Germany has thus assumed a great task which involves much sacrifice but which will result in a great service.

A NEW PARAGRAPH IN CHRISTIAN HISTORY

Ralph D. Heim

Two hundred fifty representatives of fifty countries attended a World Institute on Christian Education at Emmanuel College, University of Toronto, July 19 to August 10. The World Council of Christian Education sponsored the meeting for advanced study of principles and procedures in the teaching work of the church.

It was another "first" in Christian history. World conventions on Christian education have been held occasionally since 1889. Yet no world group of this size had ever met for as long as three weeks and covered so much scope as intensively.

In an opening service of worship, the delegates sang "How Sweet the Name of Jesus Sounds," each in his own tongue, and prayed the Lord's Prayer similarly. From that time forward, men and women from Iceland to New Zealand and around the equator from British Guiana to Fiji realized "in Christ there is no East and West, in him no South or North."

The institute had three aims:

To enable the members to learn from one another and from the ablest leaders in Christian education through an exchange of experience, ideas, and problems.

To assemble information and prepare manuscripts which may become resources for leaders in all countries.

To formulate proposals for submission to The World Council of Christian Education concerning work which may be done subsequently.

After daily morning worship, led by the various nationals, there were lectures on fundamental issues like "The Christian Conception of Man and His Salvation," "The Gospel Message and the Christian Community," and "The Essentials of Christian Education." The speakers included V. M. Koshy, Executive Secretary of the Indian Sunday School Union, who approved the declaration that "he who Christianizes democracy will Christianize the world." Another was G. Baez-Camargo of Mexico, an associate secretary

for literature in the Spanish-speaking countries. He presented Jesus Christ as Teacher and Lord, not only the central message of Christian education but also the example in the practice of Christian education.

Following each morning address, ten study groups related the topic to some particular phase of Christian education—work in rural areas, in Moslem countries, among pre-literate peoples, and others.

The language of the institute was English, with a few exceptions in which interpreters were used. As someone remarked, "You can be ecumenical if you can speak English."

Twelve study commissions met each afternoon and evening. They were expected to produce statements concerning the scope and principles of action in their particular area of study. Their work was based on the *Sourcebook of Christian Education around the World Today,* a series of reports on regional studies made during the preceding months.

Each member of the institute could work in two of the commissions, for example, *The Commission on Education in the Local Church* and *The Commission on the Bible in Christian Education.*

The first of those was headed by an Australian, with secretaries from England and Japan. Its work was done by general discussion and special studies in sub-committees. Also, several resource leaders were called upon. In one session the commission heard reports on the total task of Christian education in the local church by members from Indonesia, Germany, the United States, and Korea.

The Korean representative had narrowly escaped martyrdom at the hands of the Japanese a few years ago. Now he could report that South Korea had the largest congregation in the Orient—five thousand members—and, as a matter of course, nearly all are members of the Sunday School there.

The Commission on the Bible in Christian Education had as its chairman a village-born young Nigerian, now a student at the University of London. An American and a Canadian served as his

secretaries and they, with a Frenchman, made up the steering and drafting committee for the commission.

This commission nearly bogged down on theological problems concerning the Bible but heartily agreed that The Book should be used as the Word of God. It struck its real stride in three subcommittees which dealt with specific problems on educational use of the Bible with children, young people, and adults respectively.

After two weeks of study, the commissions reported their findings to the entire institute. There was spirited discussion with the principal debates involving the Europeans, especially the British, and the Americans. Other groups usually shared the American viewpoint, although the newer churches had to be constantly reiterating their evangelistic emphasis, along with literacy problems. Also, the Latin-American delegations were compelled frequently to mention their special problems in areas dominated by Roman Catholicism.

Other difficulties were more serious, in a way. Since this was the first such institute, most of the members were having their initial experience with ecumenical group work. Besides, it was a time of laying foundations instead of building on them, and there was no limitation of topics because the entire field was under survey.

Yet there was an unfailing resource in the spirit of Christian fellowship and devotion to a common cause. Thus the "United Nations of Christian Education" produced constructive contributions of a high order. The best of them were personal, doubtless, but a volume will be published after extensive editorial revision of the commission reports.

The program took a more immediately practical turn during the third week. Interest groups were formed to consider Bible study, drama, worship, music, and discussion procedures in Christian education.

A laboratory-demonstration school paralleled the entire institute and made the discussions more concrete. A group of international children's workers had enrolled a group of Toronto children for sessions in a nearby church. Delegates could observe the

work and get practice in it if they chose. The school's curriculum materials included the Bible "Pictures for Children Everywhere" which the children of America are providing for world children through The World Council of Christian Education.

Attendance at the institute was on invitation. Thus the representations from the various countries were kept in balance. Only thirty were able to attend from the United States. The next largest delegation was the Indian, with fourteen, and the Canadian with thirteen persons.

Lutherans came from Germany and the Scandinavian countries; only one from the Western hemisphere. More unusual among Lutheran delegates was Professeur Jean Baptiste Ranaive, Directeur L'Ecole Regionale Lutherienne, Antanifosty, Madagascar. There were also two Lutherans wearing the characteristic black national hat of Indonesia: I. P. Simandjoentak, the government's secretary of the National Council of Christian Education, and Paidotun Sarumpaet, president of the seminary of the Batak church.

American representatives found themselves receiving fully as much as they could possibly give. Latin Americans in attendance surprised their North American brethren with the forward-looking character of educational endeavor south of the border. European work gave the impression of substance and stability along with traditionalism. Asian and African effort showed evidence of freshness and urgency. Everywhere there is post-war eagerness to meet the critical mid-century issues with winsome witness and creative enterprise.

WANTED: A THEORY OF THE LAITY IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH

Conrad Bergendoff

Or should the title read, in Lutheran "Churches"? For it is one of the purposes of this paper to indicate that there is no clear doctrine of the laity in the Lutheran Church, with the result that

various theories flourish in the absence of such a doctrine, and consequently no uniformity can be said to exist in the church.

Ragnar Askmark has recently published a voluminous work on *Ämbetet I Den Svenska Kyrkan.* It is one of the few very competent studies on the subject of the place of the ministry in Lutheran doctrine. His purpose is to sketch the development of the doctrine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, up to and through the period of Pietism, especially in Sweden. But since he makes constant reference to the German situation, we may take his study as typical of Lutheranism, and then, in the light of his conclusions, ask concerning the place of the laity in the American Lutheran bodies.

In brief the course of development in the Swedish Church was as follows: The doctrine of the priesthood of believers was taken over fully by the Swedish reformers, from Luther. The Reformation uniformly repudiated the Roman theory of the priest as ordained to offer the sacrifice of the Mass. There was no such sacrifice, the Mass was a perversion of the New Testament Eucharist. Consequently there could be no such priesthood as Rome's. The evangelical priest was committed to a proclamation of the Gospel, and since every Christian was justified by grace it was a part of every Christian's duty to witness to this grace. The fundamental occasion for any ordained ministry was the need for order in the congregation. The congregation gave to appointed members the right to preach and to administer the sacraments—the source of power to select and to recall ministers ever remained in the congregation.

But the incipient evangelical church faced innumerable difficulties, both theoretical and practical. The fixing of the doctrine of the Word and Sacrament and the administration of discipline—the power of the keys—tended to give the clergy a place which Luther would have retained for the congregation. In Sweden the episcopal succession remained unbroken, and the clergy found itself the spokesman for the church over against a government which wanted to encroach on its privileges and possessions. Gradually the bishop and the chapter not only were entrusted with the admin-

istration of discipline and calling of pastors, but, during the period of Orthodoxy actually asserted the doctrine that the clergy represented the church. The doctrine of Orders was elaborated and a static constitution of society was envisaged, consisting of 1) the family, 2) the government, 3) the clergy. Only Pietism was able successfully to challenge this arrangement.

In Germany the conditions were different. The evangelical congregations did not have any bishops, but came into more direct relationship with the princes. The consistory was supposed to be representative of both the spiritual and temporal aspects of the church. We know that this instrument was used by the prince so as to place the control of the church in his hands. The church lost its independence, and in one form or another was subject to state determination even into our own time. Melanchthon's doctrine of obedience to church authority was translated into an obedience to state church authority.

It is of course due to historical circumstances that the Lutheran Church developed in this manner. But it is instructive to note how the orthodox churchmen of Sweden elaborated the theory which fitted these circumstances. In order to bring recalcitrant members under the authority of the church they did not rely, as Luther did, entirely on the power of the Word. The congregation theoretically possessed the power of the keys just as the congregation had the power to call its own pastors and hold them to the preaching of the Word. But it seemed best to delegate this power, first of proclamation, to the clergy because they were learned in Scripture, and then of discipline, because they knew better how to deal with offenders. Askmark indicates how Luther's conception of the power of the keys in this process became transformed from a power to loose to a power to bind. The New Testament knows only of a power to forgive sins, not a power to compel obedience. For 150 years in Sweden the clergy exercised a disciplinary function in the community until in 1686 this was transferred to the secular authorities. But the clergy meanwhile had formulated a theory of orders which made them a separate class in society with special privileges and duties. Using the doctrine of the three orders

the clergy differentiated themselves from the family and the government. They had trained the housefather to assume the duty of inculcating respect for and obedience to the clergy in his household, but forbidden him to exercise other priestly duties, so that it was forbidden by law for laymen to meet together for spiritual edification. They had carried on a successful opposition to the secular government and made it conscious of its duty to protect the church and its privileges. This is not to say that their policy may not be justified. We are only tracing the course of events. But it becomes clear that in the development the clergy assumed the role of *ecclesia representativa,* and the doctrine of the church was closed by a view of the ministry which made the latter an order more akin to Roman theory than Reformation teaching. Chapters and diocesan synods were made up only of clerics. The bishop and chapter called, examined, and ordained ministers. Even the act of ordination was vested with a sacramental meaning foreign to the Reformation.

It was this kind of theory of the church which Pietism reacted against. It questioned the validity of the ministry as an order and held that only a regenerate pastor could proclaim the gospel. It went even further in making the new birth, rather than baptism, the mark of the Christian, thus overthrowing the theoretical structure built up by Orthodoxy. In one sense Pietism went back to the Reformation teaching of the universal priesthood of believers—that was its strength. But it differed from Luther's teaching in defining the believer on the basis not of justification but of sanctification. Askmark has epitomized the transition from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries in this way: "In the Reformation the ministry was always the ministry of the Word and assigned to the service of the Word. Orthodoxy's deviation lay in making the ministry of the Word a word of the ministry, and the ministry seeks a position outside of or above the Word. In Pietism the Word becomes the word of the minister, so that the minister's piety and regeneration become prerequisites for an effective proclamation of the Word" (p. 24).

This very interesting study opens up many avenues of investigation. I am here interested in the light it throws on the Lutheran

doctrine of the laity. Indeed the phrase itself sounds strange—someone may ask if there need be such a doctrine. Askmark remarks that the teaching concerning the universal priesthood disappeared with the century of the Reformation from theological thinking and was assigned to an obscure place in devotional literature (p. 143). As far as theological textbooks are concerned it is still a forgotten doctrine. Occasionally it appears in homiletics and practical theology, but it has no clear place in systematic theology. Is not theology, anyhow, for pastors only? We are surprised when laymen become interested in theological education. In several American Lutheran synods the word "ministerium" remains as a direct heritage, not of the Reformation, but of Orthodoxy. We struggle with a doctrine of the church, but more often than not are thinking only in terms of the ministry. I would prefer to speak of the doctrine of the church but must place the doctrine of the laity against the doctrine of the ministry in order to get out of a perspective which is Melanchthonian rather than Lutheran. How pertinent such a study may be can be illustrated by reference to two synodical meetings last June in our American Lutheran Church—one contained more clerical delegates than lay, the other debated whether a layman should be a college president! And how little thinking we have done in America on the question of the doctrine of the church is evident from the fact that we have not yet a single book on church polity which describes the variety of inherited polities our churches here possess. The episcopal system of Sweden, the Inner Mission of Denmark, the congregational system of Norway, the territorial patterns of Germany, the native experiments on our own soil—it may be true that such a variety exemplifies the secondary place which Lutheran doctrine gives to organization. It may also be true that our ignorance of the effects of these systems may result in a secondary place for the laity which understands even less than the clergy how we got to be what we are. It may be, too, that our American church may develop doctrines of the ministry which will repeat the unfortunate results of European organization, and lead us away from the riches of the Reformation. Already there are tendencies in America to make of the ministry a

class, an order, that represents the church. There are liturgical temptations not far away which would give the pastor a character not far removed from a *character indelibilis* and a grace not possessed by the laity. But greatest of all is the peril of leaving unexplored and unused the treasure of the universal priesthood, which is of as great an importance as any special order of the ministry.

The doctrine of the laity must grow out of the doctrine of the universal priesthood. Ephesians 4:11 has too much been interpreted by advocates of an Old Testament hierarchy and too rigidly applied to the New Testament church. "He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers." When Pietism in Sweden insisted on the priesthood of believers, Orthodoxy replied that Christians might be anointed as priests, but not as prophets, and that the ordained pastors' word had a power not possessed by the layman's (p. 220). This reveals how loosely the theologians used the distinction between prophet and priest. The Lutheran Church as a whole has refused to see in the New Testament a prototype of orders, such as underlies the Roman and Anglican theories of bishop, priest, and deacon. But the Lutheran Church has never dared give the freedom to the church which Luther gave. Instead it has first differentiated between the ordained clergy's power as given *iure divino* and *iuro humano* but has never succeeded in maintaining the distinction practically with the result that in the name of the God of order the priesthood has become an order exercising, in the eyes of the people, even its human authority as a divine commission. This in itself may be justifiable because of the need of order in the church, but the unfortunate consequence has been that only what the pastor does has been considered the ministry of the church. "Holy orders" is a term monopolized by the clergy. The layman's work is considered secular. Be he doctor, lawyer, business man, teacher, factory worker or farmer, his work belongs to a different realm than that of the "ordained" minister.

It is my belief that when Paul refers to apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, and connects their ministry

with the building up of the body of Christ, he is thinking in far greater dimensions than our current conceptions of building up our local congregations or even synodical bodies. Luther's conception of the universal priesthood made every Christian a minister to his neighbor. Not that every Christian should be the pastor of the congregation, but the Christian industrial and professional worker builds up the body of Christ as well as the parish minister. We talk as if the Ladies' Aid, by giving coffee parties and contributing to the pastor's salary, were doing a churchly job, but that the Christian mayor or business man was only in a secular job. We have too narrowly restricted the definition of the church and magnified the office of the pastor at the expense of the office of the non-ordained Christian. I am not suggesting that we need to take away any of the honor we have given the clergy. But it is time we considered the honor due to other members of the body of Christ.

The doctrine of the clergy was formulated at a time when the laity was considered as being in the other two estates: the home and the government. Since the seventeenth century the relationship of the ministry to the government has changed fundamentally. I do not think it unhistorical to say that in the period of Orthodoxy the place of the laity was represented by the government. Government then was at least a part of Christian society and its officers were included in the doctrine of the church. Now government has ceased to be Christian in name if not in principle, and all its representatives have lost the standing they formerly held in a view of the Christian body. Only the clergy remains as officers in the Christian community, with an increase in importance in the church. But the theory of the laity limps badly because no other place was given the dispossessed temporal authorities when the state forfeited its relationship to the church.

The situation is no better in regard to the other estate: the home. Orthodoxy gave the housefather the task of teaching his family and servants respect for the ministry. Now even the term housefather is obsolete. The feudal and aristocratic society which formed the background for the thought of Orthodoxy has given

way to a democratic and socialistic society where the home is struggling for a place of its own. The home no less than government has become secularized, and the school which formerly stood in the territory of the church has been transferred to the state or to industry. The ministry in the seventeenth century developed a doctrine of representation—the ordained clergy represented the church. We stand in the danger today of identifying the clergy and the church, and of depending on the clergy to transmit the church from one generation to another. Again the tendency is Roman in character—the clergy are the church and the laity are to obey and support the clergy.

Against this tendency we can place the Reformation teaching of the Word. The evangelical ministry is the ministry of the Word, a ministry that includes every Christian. To some is given the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments. To others belong the task of teaching, not only in Sunday Schools, but in public schools, in colleges and universities, the task of governing, not only Luther Leagues and Ladies' Aid or conference boards, but of cities, states, and nations, the task of serving, not only at church tables or in charitable institutions, but in the institutions of the community. The building up of the Body of Christ is not to be confined to the building of First Church on Main Street or the parsonage next door, but to the serving of our neighbors wherever there is need, even if the label of "Lutheran" be not in evidence. The God who lets His sun shine on all alike is not adequately revealed when our suburban congregations do good only to those who return the favor. There is a wideness in the mercy of God which is foreign to many of His children. Out of the congregation of believers should come a stream of ministers whose influence would be felt in every department of human life—education, commerce, art, literature, agriculture, the press, in labor, management. If the Spirit of God moved more mightily in our churches He would blow over many of the pretty partitions we have erected in the House of God.

The evangelical interpretation of ordination is not an impartation of a peculiar character on the candidate, but a lifting of

the hands of the congregation (theoretically why should this be limited to the hands of ministers?) in prayer, asking God to bless this servant in His appointed task. One Swedish version of the ordination rite calls it simply, "Prayer." We need no less dignity for the "consecration" of every Christian to his ministry, and the lifting up of every calling to the throne of God for His blessing and sanction. The classic hymn of ordination is "Veni, Creator Spiritus"—a church which really believes in the priesthood of all believers ought to be able to sing this stanza with evangelical faith that it concerns every faithful witness to the "measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

Come, O creator Spirit, come,
And make within our hearts thy home;
To us thy grace celestial give,
Who of thy breathing move and live.

Thou dost appear in sevenfold dower
The sign of God's almighty power;
The Father's promise, making rich
With saving truth our earthly speech.

Our senses with thy light inflame,
Our hearts to heavenly love reclaim;
Our bodies' poor infirmity
With strength perpetual fortify.

Our mortal foe afar repel,
Grant us henceforth in peace to dwell;
And so to us, with thee for guide,
No ill shall come, no harm betide.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

Commentary on Romans. By Anders Nygren. Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1949. 457 pages. $5.00.

The book under review is a translation by Carl C. Rasmussen of Bishop Nygren's Romans published in Sweden in 1944. The translation is in clear, idiomatic English, avoiding all the harshnesses of foreign idioms. The English student of Romans will find in this work an extremely readable exposition of Paul's classic treatment of the cardinal doctrines of the faith.

Luther's estimate of Paul's work as "rightly the chief part of the New Testament and the clearest gospel of all" is amply vindicated by the concise, scriptural, and generally scholarly treatment by the author. The treatment follows the natural outline in Paul's mind and does no violence to the text by superimposing a dogmatic outline of the author's own conceiving. Dr. Nygren is unwilling to construe Paul's thought as a philosophy of history, maintaining Paul's own conviction that his thought is a direct revelation from God. Here, then, is theology in its purest form. The material of the text makes explicit this conviction.

The chief theme consists of the two related conceptions of the righteousness of God and the unrighteousness of man. From the second chapter on to the end, the treatment is a working out of this theme. One might desire a more explicit statement of the character of God's righteousness from the developing and continuing Old Testament point of view. The rejection of a theodicy of any sort may correspond to Paul's thought, but man does persist in asking repeatedly, "Why has God made me thus?" and rightly deserves a satisfying reply. Predestination often leaves one in a bitterly uncertain state. If this reviewer's judgment is correct, the doctrine of predestination in Romans 8:28-30 is a triumphant confirmation of God's abounding mercy, and an assurance that men who live in the Spirit are saved. In this section we feel that the author has not done full justice to Paul's thought.

One may take exception to the bishop's interpretation of Romans 8:28. This writer's study of the text has convinced him that the subject of the verb is the unexpressed term, the Spirit, which has controlled Paul's thought throughout the whole passage. Thus "all things" becomes an accusative of respect. The Trinity cooperates to the fullest in conferring the divine blessings on the called. In an unfriendly universe, the Christian may be assured that he is safe in the Everlasting Arms.

The last section of the treatment deals with man's conduct in the new aeon. The thought of the apostle, so clearly conceived and satisfyingly expressed by Nygren, is no sedative in our disturbed world. Yet his ethic should awaken the Christian world to a sense of the divine operation in human affairs and should offer a directive in the approach to all our problems. Not "virtue" but "grace" is the key to man's ethical renewal. The author clarifies our thinking by rightly interpreting Paul.

Such a scriptural commentary as this is greatly needed in our day. Bishop Nygren has written for the thinking and sincere Christian. For all seminary students the book is a must.

Arthur C. P. Hays

---

1 Books received or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

The Great Redemption. A Living Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By Chester Warren Quimby. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 213 pages. $2.50.

Another "come alive" book! Like most of the current books about the Bible, it was written "to make an ancient writing *come alive,* and walk abroad today." Professor Quimby, who has had a rich and varied experience as a preacher, lecturer, and college professor, has succeeded admirably in his efforts to make the Epistle to the Romans "come alive" and speak to our condition. There is not a dull page in the book.

The introductory chapter includes a concise but very readable digest of the Epistle as a whole. The second chapter takes the form of a vivid and helpful picture of life in the Imperial City in the first century. The author then proceeds to analyze the Epistle, section by section, with both eyes fixed upon the needs and interests of the ordinary reader. The expositions are necessarily rather sketchy at spots. The writer concentrates upon the "leading ideas" of the Epistle and then apologizes repeatedly for "laboring" them. One wishes that he had curtailed the "laboring" and the apologies in order to find space for a fuller exposition. Moreover, his anxiety to hold the interest of his readers trips him into a few unhappy distortions. For example, Paul's more or less routine references to sex in the first chapter are blown up into major issues whereas less "interesting" items in the chapter are glossed over lightly. The highly emotional outbursts against denominationalism are not only superficial but also somewhat gratuitous. Like all other commentators on the Epistle, Professor Quimby is at his best when he follows Paul's thought closely; he is at his worst when he departs from Paul and begins to "preach" to his readers. Some pages are made to carry too much Quimby and not enough Paul. Fortunately, such pages are not very numerous.

The expositions for the most part follow traditional lines. They are characterized by freshness of presentation rather than originality of insight. Here and there the reviewer came upon interpretations which he considers erroneous or at least doubtful. Although limitations of space prevent him from going into details, he feels in duty bound to call attention to a minor but awkward slip which should be corrected in subsequent editions. On page 185, in a sentence which was presumably dictated by Paul's words in 13:11, we read that "actually Christ's coming is much nearer than he, at first, had reckoned." What Paul is saying in this verse is that the Day of Salvation is now nearer than it was when he and his readers first *became believers.* He is not saying that it is nearer than he, at first, had reckoned or supposed.

Professor Quimby's breezy commentary will undoubtedly serve a useful purpose. The recent spate of publications on the Epistle to the Romans augurs well for the future of the church. Most of the vital and vitalizing movements within the church since the first century have been sparked by a revival of interest in Paul's masterpiece.

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser: Eine Herausforderung an die Macht. By Hans Asmussen. Breklum: Christian Jensen Verlag, 1949. 136 pages. DM 7.20.

The subtitle might lead one to expect another challenge to the power of the state against which the German church had to defend its life and independence in the last decades. But the reader will learn soon that Asmussen uses the term *Macht* in a larger sense. One of the difficulties in reading Asmussen is his frequent use of common terms to which he gives altogether unfamiliar connotations and meanings not found in other German theological writing.

The book contains an introduction in

which the author explains the points of view under which he conducts his study. The text of the letter is not reprinted in the book; instead a synopsis or paraphrase of the familiar words are offered. In one sense this is an advantage: the reader is confronted by the thoughts of the letter before he is lost in the commentary on its words. In another sense this synopsis is a danger: the reader may easily forget that Asmussen wrote it, not Paul. The commentary proper is printed under this synopsis in smaller type. It comprises the greatest bulk of the book and contains much valuable and original material. Little is presented that is of purely historical or philological interest. The question of authorship is decided in favor of Paul in two short sentences. The letter must have been addressed to some one: whether Ephesians or Laodiceans or all Christians is of no concern to Asmussen. He presents it as "a challenge to power," and the whole content is interpreted from that point of view.

In the Introduction the author asserts that "the letter to the Ephesians does not allow us to understand our nature or existence simply as an event between God and the soul. The space between us and God is occupied because it is a cosmos" (p. 7). This cosmos or universe is occupied or filled by objects or objectivities (Gegenständen und Gegenständlichkeiten). The reader has the uncomfortable feeling that the hypostases of Judaistic theology (Memra, Shekinah) are once again presented under the guise of a "new" theological exegesis. Asmussen speaks of *göttliche Gegenständlichkeiten* — grace, sonship, truth, love, mercy—and *Gegenständlichkeiten der Menschen*—sin and evil powers. When man is "renewed in the spirit" his Gegenständlichkeit has become another (p. 77). The author defends his peculiar emphasis by pointing to those hymns in which the love and the mercy of God are adored. (To the reviewer's knowledge none of these creations of an extreme Germany Pietism have ever been accepted in the American churches, though some have been translated.)

These objectivities which are occupying such an important place in the universe are also called "spiritual realities" (p. 25). Why Asmussen studiously avoids this familiar terminology the reviewer does not understand. A church which does not take these realities into consideration and pretends to be confronted by rationally controlled men alone, has not yet understood that we are not fighting against flesh and blood. "It distributes medieval armor as defense against atom bombs."

The subtitle of the book, "A Challenge to Power," points out the major emphasis which Asmussen finds in Ephesians, beginning with 1:11, where he comments: "God works, i.e. He exercises his power" (p. 33). Yet the vocabulary of the passage as well as the context seem to emphasize many other attributes of God more than power. The unfolding of the power of God is seen in resurrection, ascension, and faith. The effect of the saving work of Christ is seen in the fact that he is now enthroned high above all "intermediary powers" (p. 39 f.). But these same powers provide "the setting for, and the measure of, our sin" (p. 44).

The best part of the book is the chapter on "The Doctrine of the Church in Ephesians" (pp. 96-117). "The church stands in the same relationship to Christ as Christ to the universe. Christ completes the universe, the church completes Christ" (p. 97). But Asmussen also finds a sense in which the church and Jesus Christ must be named side by side (p. 103). This church "has to accomplish tasks which can no longer be comprehended rationally" (p. 103). But then these tasks, within the German nation and the world, are stated in a fairly rational, though unusual, manner. At its best the work is difficult reading, yet rewarding to anyone who takes the time to check the deductions of Asmussen against the words of the Epistle from which he starts.

On the whole, there seems to be much more of Asmussen in this work than of the thoughts of the writer of Ephesians. But any reader will become sufficiently acquainted with both these outstanding Christians to make the study of this book a worthwhile endeavor, though he should understand at the beginning that it will challenge all *his* powers.

H. Karl Ladwig

Bibelns värld och vår. By Nils Johansson. Lund: Gleerups Förlag, 1949. 211 pages. Kr. 9.50.

An expanded translation of the title would be: "A Comparison Between the Biblical World-view and Ours." The title thus indicates the content and the purpose. The author is concerned to make available to the present generation, in terms which they can understand, the fundamental message of the Bible. He is convinced that the results of historical criticism must be accepted and utilized for this purpose. He points out, for instance, that the conception of the universe has changed in the course of time. The transition from the view that the earth was flat and had four corners to the Ptolemaic geocentric view occurred during the period of the early church and seems to have been accomplished without too much controversy. But the Copernican view met with determined opposition by the church. It was not until 1822 that the Roman church permitted books to be printed which taught that the earth revolves around the sun. Historical criticism has produced another Copernican revolution, and many Christians find it difficult to make an honest and sincere confession of faith as long as these biblical problems remain unsolved. If some of these ancient conceptions have to be given up, what becomes of the authority and the trustworthiness of the rest of the Bible?

The author first discusses the mystery of salvation and the Kingdom of God. He insists that the revelation in Christ was not, nor is, a self-evident manifestation of the divine. The gospel is a great paradox of grace, which Jesus had to present in parables and signs. The mystery is seen only by those whose eyes are open and who believe in Jesus. Even the disciples did not understand until after a long period of instruction. Jesus did not require a confession of faith when they joined the fellowship, but he led them gradually until they could say, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The author suggests that the pastor and teacher of religion should realize that the gospel is a mystery which can be apprehended only under the continuous guidance and activity of the Spirit.

With this conception of the gospel as a background the author discusses some of the Christian affirmations which are difficult for modern man to receive: the person of Christ, the Lord's Supper, discipleship, miracles, gifts of grace, and eschatology. As an example of his treatment we may summarize his discussion of the gifts of grace. Charismata are "every extraordinary effect produced by the Spirit in the believer." The number and variety of these gifts are indicated in I Corinthians 12:4 ff. and Galatians 5:22-23. It is evident that the early church prized highly such unusual manifestations as glossolalia, exorcisms, healings, and prophecy. It is equally evident that the church today does not put such value upon them. The problem becomes acute when the pastor is to preach on the texts assigned for Pentecost. The author suggests that the work of the Spirit is always, under whatever forms, to bring men to the point of asking, "Brethren, what shall we do?" Luther, in his explanation of the third article, describes the work of the Spirit, but he does so without mentioning glossolalia, exorcism, prophecy, or healings. "When he says that the Spirit calls, gathers, enlightens and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth, he has translated many of the New Testament affirmations about charismata into the language of his own and our time" (p. 196).

The author is both a pastor and a trained scholar in the field of the New Testament. Consequently he is conscious of the problems which confront the pastor in his proclamation of the gospel to modern man. There are many valuable suggestions in this book and much that will give any Christian a deeper insight into the meaning of the gospel.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus. By Amos N. Wilder. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. 223 pages. $2.50.

This is a revised edition of the widely-used volume which Professor Wilder issued in 1939. Recognizing many important changes as having taken place in the past decade in Christian thought relative to Jesus and his teaching concerning the last times, the author has sought to explore and evaluate these recent developments and to draw fresh conclusions where it seemed desirable.

He has revised and enlarged the second and third chapters of the introductory sections, bringing up to date the material on the eschatological teaching of Jesus. In Part I he has made only minor changes, but he has introduced numerous modifications in Part II. He deals incisively with Schweitzer's concept of "interim ethics," Dodd's "realized eschatology," and Bultmann's "form criticism." He finds in Jesus' demands, particularly his urgency to repentance, not an "interim ethic," but an "emergency ethic" which has revelance for our discipleship.

In some respects the author has modified his earlier views, particularly in regard to the messianic claims of Christ. He considers the present tendency of New Testament scholarship and of New Testament theology to lie "in the direction of a more positive interpretation of the future of men's life on the earth" (p. 68).

Emphasizing this point of view, he adds, "It is more important and timely today than ever to urge that the teaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom means in part a genuine hope for the future of men in this world" (p. 69).

Among the fundamental sanctions for ethical living which Dr. Wilder notes are: rewards and punishments, the nature of God, the authority of Scripture, the authority and example of Jesus, and his eschatological approach. Each of these sanctions he evaluates in a fresh and scintillating way.

In his conclusions, in which he attempts to evaluate the teaching of Jesus in the light of recent discussions, he does not fail to deal with the more important contributions made in the field in the last decade, including those brought out in the discussions of the Amsterdam Assembly.

Summarizing his thought, he states, "Our appeal should not be to an anachronistic and literal Second Coming or forensic Judgment viewed as impending in our day. Yet we can properly appeal to rewards and penalties, eschatological and otherwise, as a legitimate way of making clear the fateful character of conduct. . . . What is above all imperative is that we should continually recapture a dynamic vision of God . . ." (p. 193).

This is a book about which there will be much fresh discussion, as there was when the first edition appeared more than a decade ago. The topic is central and timely.

E. E. FLACK

The Mystery of the Kingdom of God. The Secret of Jesus' Messiahship and Passion. By Albert Schweitzer. Translated with an Introduction by Walter Lowrie. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 174 pages. $3.00.

In 1901, the year in which Wrede published his *Messianic Secret in the Gospels,* Albert Schweitzer, at the age of twenty-six, hurled a delayed-action bomb into the ranks of New Testament scholars with his brilliant and extensive treatise entitled *Das Abendmahl.* At first the treatise was virtually ignored, particularly in Ger-

many, but the conspiracy of silence which greeted its publication eventually gave way to intense furor as scholars became increasingly aware of the implications of the position the new star on the horizon was taking. In 1913 the *second* part of the earlier work was translated into English, with an interesting and helpful Introduction by the translator. The second part has now been reprinted for the benefit of the still growing hordes of Schweitzer fans. On its pages we see a profound, original, and courageous mind at work, honestly endeavoring to think its way into the clear through the labyrinth of vexing but fascinating problems raised by the gospel records of the ministry of Jesus.

Although reprints do not call for reviews, *The Lutheran Quarterly* is happy to salute this reprint of a pioneer work which made history in its day and which is still of interest to serious students of the New Testament. Too many of them begin their reading of Schweitzer with his *Quest of the Historical Jesus.* They should by all means read the earlier work first. It throws important light upon Schweitzer's subsequent writings as well as upon his career as a scholar and a Christian.

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

The Apostolic Fathers: An American Translation. By Edgar J. Goodspeed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950. xi, 321 pages. $3.75.

"Americans," says Professor Robert M. Grant, "have no reason to feel ashamed of their patristic achievements, for example, in the 'Ancient Christian Writers' series, but their laurels are not sufficient for rest. If men can be encouraged to study Greek and Latin, even after they have reached seminary, and simply to read the Fathers, it will be possible for them to participate in the golden age of patristics which lies just ahead. . . . Because of the tremendous labors of patristic scholars in the last hundred years the banquet has been prepared. All that remains is for the guests to arrive. To paraphrase another parable, even those laborers in the vineyard who came to work last will receive a generous reward" ("The Future of the Ante-Nicene Fathers," in *The Journal of Religion,* XXX (Apr. 1950), 116).

Throughout his long career Dr. Goodspeed has been diligent in helping to prepare this banquet. In 1907 he published his *Index patristicus;* in 1912 an *Index apologeticus;* in 1914 *Die ältesten Apologeten;* and in 1942 *A History of Early Christian Literature.* Now he follows his "American" translation of the New Testament (1923) and of the Apocrypha (1938) with the Apostolic Fathers.

Measured by the needs and achievements of present research, the handicap of the older translations, such as those in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* is not only their antiquated introductions and critical notes but their habit of assimilating their English style to that of the King James Bible. Dr. Goodspeed brings the Greek text up to date, discards the "thee" and "thou" framework and otherwise thoroughly modernizes the English. His translation is based on the Funk-Bihlmeyer edition (Vol. I, 1924), except for the Shepherd of Hermas, for which he used Lake's edition in the Loeb Library (1913), "with occasional emendations derived from the papyri." His canon of the Apostolic Fathers is more inclusive than Lake's; in addition to First and Second Clement, Ignatius, the Letter, and the Martyrdom, of Polycarp, the Didache, Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Address to Diognetus, he translates the Latin document known as the "Doctrina" and includes the Apology of Quadratus and certain fragments of Papias. He provides each work with a brief historical and critical introduction; but, as compared with Lake, he gives no footnotes on difficult points of the text, and he lists all the Scripture references at the end of the book instead of printing them on the margins. This may be a concession to the popular antipathy to footnotes and

to the cost of publication, but it is certainly an inconvenience to the student.

In his Introduction Dr. Goodspeed says, "Definite advances in textual materials for Hermas, and even at a few points in Greek lexicography, as well as the need of a franker, more modern and unflinching translation are reflected in the present version. And the literary relationships of the several writings to one another and to the books of the New Testament can now in some cases be more definitely determined." Discussion of these matters constitutes the distinctive contribution made by his introductions to the several writings and by the appendix, which presents a cogent argument for the view that the Doctrina is a Latin translation of a Greek writing "which can now be shown to be the source of the Greek Didache, and of the Greek Barnabas, as well as of most of the later documents that have long been regarded as reproducing material from the Greek Didache."

One problem of the translator is to decide whether to make his version clearer than the original. The long sentence in I Clement 59:2-3 (164 words in Lake's Greek text) is a case in point. Lake translates: "2. but we shall be innocent of this sin, and will pray with eager entreaty and supplication that the Creator of the Universe may guard unhurt the number of his elect that has been numbered in all the world through his beloved child Jesus Christ, through whom he called us from darkness to light, from ignorance to the full knowledge of the glory of his name.

"3. Grant us to hope on thy name, the source of all creation, open the eyes of our heart to know thee, that thou alone art the highest in the highest and remainest holy among the holy. . . ." Thus the sentence is broken into two paragraphs. The words "Grant us" are not in the Greek, and Lake calls attention to what "appears to be a lacuna" which necessitates some such addition to make it clear. Dr. Goodspeed, changing "thou," "thee" and "thy" to "you" and "your" translates: ". . . through whom he called us from darkness to light, from ignorance to the recognition of the glory of his name, to hope in your name, which is the source of all creation, opening the eyes of our mind to know you. . . ." Thus the translation indicates the difficulty which lies in the Greek itself; but without a footnote the reader has no means of knowing this, and the "you" and "your" make it difficult for him to realize that he has begun the prayer which the first part of this long Greek sentence has introduced. Then, when he comes to the end of it, he is further perplexed to read: "who multiply nations on the earth and have chosen from all men those that love thee through Jesus Christ your beloved child, through whom you have trained, sanctified, and honored us." In translating prayers it is better to retain the second person singular, as Dr. Goodspeed himself has done in the Prayer of Polycarp (Martyrdom, 14), though not in the Lord's Prayer (Did. 8:2). Clement's sentence consists of a long series of Greek participles, and when these are turned into relative clauses introduced by "you, who" it is difficult to keep in mind that one is reading a prayer.

Another modern translation of the Apostolic Fathers is Vol. I of the Roman Catholic translation of the Church Fathers which is planned for 72 volumes under the editorial direction of Dr. Ludwig Schopp (New York: Cima Publishing Co., 1947). This version is designed not only for Roman Catholics but for the entire English-speaking world at a time when serious thinkers "are seeking to find in these writings the path by which humanity can perhaps retrace its steps to the solidarity it has lost." This, too, is an excellent translation. Compared with the everydayness of Dr. Goodspeed's style, it filters the light of the Fathers through ecclesiastical windows colored by the tradition that has been growing through the centuries since these historical documents were written. The translators have tried to keep "as close as possible to the mean-

ing and the spirit of the original as is compatible with the character of modern English." Yet the impartial historian must always take account of the "Nihil obstat" and the "Imprimatur." Hence the value of such independent translations as this one which Dr. Goodspeed has brought to the patristic banquet. Here the spirit of the translator looks forward to the achievement of a human solidarity which has never yet been reached, rather than backward to the recovery of a mythical solidarity that has been lost.

Protestants on being invited to the patristic banquet are tempted to send excuses, one saying, "I must translate Luther," another "Calvin," another "Kierkegaard"; forgetting that it is not a case of either-or but of "these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." Without the contribution of Protestantism the dishes on the table will not constitute a balanced diet. And that lack will be just as bad for the Protestants as for the Catholics. One has only to look at the Omaha Declaration concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures to see the effect of neglecting what these primary sources have to tell us about the history of the Canon.

RAYMOND T. STAMM

The Book of Isaiah. Vol. I, Chapters 1-39. By Julius A. Bewer. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950. 98 pages. 75 cents.

The present monograph deals with chapters 1-39 of the prophecy of Isaiah. It contains the preface to the whole book of Isaiah which in turn indicates the author's views as to the authenticity of the several parts of the prophecy. He holds that the "Book of Isaiah is . . . an anthology of prophetic messages by a number of prophets whom the Lord sent when new situations called for fresh guidance, warning or encouragement."

The historical introduction is a masterpiece of condensation. It is accurate and to the point. It is just the thing for the average student who needs to refresh his memory from time to time. The chronological chart and the classification of the several prophecies according to date is most helpful. As in the other volumes in the series, the King James text is printed in poetic form where such is indicated. The footnotes are incisive and quite effectively illuminate obscure words, references, or expressions. It is a notable work and cannot be too highly recommended.

The Book of Isaiah, Vol. II: The Second Isaiah, Chs. 40-55; The Third Isaiah, Chs. 56-66. By Julius A. Bewer. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1950. 74 pages. 75 cents.

Professor Bewer here continues his work in the Harper's Annotated Bible Series with the same skill and vigor reflected in the earlier volumes. As the above title indicates, the author holds to the general view of the multiple authorship of the book of Isaiah. The introductions to the two parts of the book dealt with in the present volume are superb, concise, accurate, and clear. The Third Isaiah is particularly well done, even though many readers may not agree with specific deductions. The evangelical note is sounded everywhere, and that is the most important feature in any book of the Bible. The textual notes are all in English and are just the thing for the average reader. What a boon to church school teachers and busy pastors!

J. M. MYERS

God's Grace and Man's Hope. By Daniel Day Williams. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949. 197 pages. $2.75.

This is the kind of solid and provocative treatment of an important subject which one would expect from the pen of Professor Williams. It deals with a problem which is of fundamental importance for Protestant theology, namely "the relation of God's final rule, his kingdom, to the kingdoms of this world" (p. 19). It makes extensive use of evangelical insights and positions, revealing at all times

a wholesome respect for traditional Christian concepts even when it departs from them. In addition, it draws upon some of the most recent philosophical developments and adapts them to the Christian tradition to a degree which alternately arouses respect and suspicion. It is, therefore, an especially valuable book for Lutheran theological students. It is sufficiently evangelical in its conception of the content of Christianity so that the Lutheran theologian cannot avoid the conclusions reached by asserting ignorance of the real meaning of Christianity. It is unconventional enough in the method that is employed to make inevitable some stretching of the mind on the part of the reader. It is to be strongly recommended for intelligent and critical study.

The contents of the volume were originally delivered as the Rauschenbusch Lectures for 1947 at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. In the Rauschenbusch lectures "man's hope" has undoubtedly received more attention than "God's grace." Professor Williams attempts to deal with both in such a way that they are relevant to each other. The Preface indicates two convictions which place this study within the Rauschenbusch tradition. The first is that "there is solid ground in human experience for believing that the better world can be made. It is cynicism and nihilism which in the last resort are unrealistic about what human life can be." The second conviction is "that any enduring hope must be based, not upon man alone, but upon the fact that God is present in human history, and is there creatively and redemptively at work" (p. 11).

The Christian church has always held that the kingdoms of this world are judged by the Kingdom of God and are, in some significant sense, to come under the dominion of his Christ. Christian faith must express itself in moral decisions. But there have been a variety of answers to the problems that arise for the Christian. The two particular types of answers which provide the foils for the author in presenting his own view are "liberalism" and "neo-orthodoxy." The analysis of both is penetrating, sympathetic, and sound. Liberal theology "has always tended to obscure the nature of sin; hence it has never adequately expressed the depth of our dependence on the redemptive work of God" (34). Neo-orthodoxy "has not made clear how redemption actually makes any difference in this life in this world" (35). Both have left out "the fact of redemption" (32). The author attempts to find out what there is in their theological construction that has led them to neglect this important fact, and then to point the way to an interpretation of the Christian gospel which, while maintaining what is true in each, will also do justice to the fact of redemption.

The clue to the reconstruction of the Protestant Christian faith in our time, he believes, "is to recall to ourselves the fact that God, the Lord of life, is both Creator and Redeemer" (38).

The most crucial, and most controversial, section of the book, from a theological viewpoint, is the discussion of "God: The Creator and Redeemer" (Chap. II) and "Man's Real Good" (Chap. III). Both deal with concepts which are central to the Christian faith in the context of our general knowledge of God and the world. He properly begins, therefore, with "the problem of evidence, of the tests of truth" (39). He identifies himself with that school of Christian thought which is consciously aware of philosophical presuppositions in theology. He asserts that "all Christian theology without exception involves general ideas about the world, and about man. These ideas are drawn from our human experience and when given critical analysis and elaborated, they are philosophical concepts" (40). This is not to say that philosophy "controls theology." Theology has its own sources of insight but it expresses itself in philosophical concepts and should be self-consciously critical in its use of them.

The author consciously associates himself with the "metaphysics of process" rather than "a metaphysics of static being" (41). He freely asknowledges his indebtedness to Whitehead, Hartshorne, Wieman, and others who have been responsible for this emphasis in the fields of metaphysics and theology. This philosophy, he believes, "makes it possible for the Living God, the God who acts, the caring, saving God of the Bible to be made intelligible" (42).

He also identifies himself as an empiricist, inasmuch as he assumes "that all knowledge, without exception, is derived from a critical interpretation of what is given in human experience" (41). This does not deny the fact of transcendence though it excludes some notions of transcendence. Transcendence has meaning for us because in a real sense "every individual is immanent in and transcends all others, and the transcendence and immanence of God is the supreme case of this double relation" (quoting Hartshorne, p. 44). The God who is present to us can be known through our "direct experience of him" (p. 45). Just as direct, it appears, as our knowledge of a chair (p. 46). But God is more complex, hidden, beyond our grasp, pervasive in all particular realities (47). Therefore, "whether or not we come to know him depends ultimately upon whether God himself so acts upon us that he produces the kind of sensitivity through which we can respond to him" (49). Unless there is such sensitivity there can be no experience. "We ourselves have to be equipped and transformed so that we can respond to what is given to us in our total experience. Our knowledge of God is the case par excellence of this necessity for sensitive discrimination and responsiveness" (49). "All knowledge of God that is recognition—and not merely cognition—of his reality, is a gift which is given by the working of God himself in our life" (50). Christians have an additional possibility of recognizing God because they "share in a living stream of historical experience in which God has disclosed himself" (50). To speak of revelation in the prophets and in Christ "is to speak of those happenings in human history which have so opened our eyes, and so transformed our minds that the disclosure of God to man has taken place." "To share in the life of this [the Christian] community, to do its work, to hear its story, to read its Book, is the way to such knowledge of God as Christians have" (50).

What we know about God as a result of this disclosure is that he is creatively and redemptively at work in history. Williams uses much of the language of Wieman in discussing both aspects of God's work. "God the Creator we know as the power which binds the surging variety of life into richer and wider societies of mutual enjoyment and support" (52). "God's redemption means the transmutation of evil and loss into new good, and higher fulfillment" (54). But it means forgiveness, too. "That every man needs forgiveness, and that forgiveness is offered to every man, is the truth of the Gospel which is the hardest for us to accept" (54). And forgiveness is not merely an act but a status; "it is a continuing quality of his love which can hold our life together even in moral defeat" (55). Against the background of this kind of an understanding of God, it can be affirmed that "God does transform rebellious and self-sufficient men into persons who can begin to love their fellows. The power which works this transformation is released in the depth of the personal life just at the point at which man finds his own self-righteousness shattered, and discovers that the mercy of God comes to him in his need" (58).

Chapter III, dealing with "Man's Real Good," undertakes an answer to the question "how we can adequately define that love which Christianity holds to be the clue to the nature of God and therefore define the content of that real good in relation to which all particular goods are

finally judged" (63). The thesis which he defends is summarized as follows: "God's unity is his goodness. God's goodness is his love. God's love is that creative and redemptive power which works unceasingly in all times and places to bring to fulfillment a universal community of free and loving beings" (64). In defending this thesis he enters upon a rather detailed analysis and criticism of Anders Nygren's interpretation of *agape*. He believes that in *agape* Christianity has a motif that transcends all other religious motifs but believes that it is inadequately represented in Nygren's formulation. "He has overstated certain tendencies in the agape motif in such a way that its positive relation to human striving and ideals is obscured" (69). In fact, the form in which he presents it constitutes a *reductio ad absurdum* of the evangelical truth. Nygren has fallen into two errors: (1) He assumes that the basic-motif must be exclusive of all other religious motifs, overlooking the possibility of its being a fulfillment of other motifs. (2) He misunderstands the structure of love which involves mutuality. The choice is not between egocentric love and the total denial of the self. There is a third alternative which includes both, namely mutual love. Here, again, Williams draws on Hartshorne's analysis in *Man's Vision of God*. (Though this reviewer is impressed by Hartshorne's profundity and thoroughness, he does not share Williams' enthusiasm for his "clarity.") Agape, as the author understands it, has nothing in it which "excludes the element of human desire for the good" (73). We are not surprised to find that he prefers Augustine's *caritas* to Nygren's *agape* (78).

Niebuhr attempts to bring Christian love into "a positive relation to the human struggle for the ideals of justice and brotherhood" (73). He does so by distinguishing between sacrificial love, which is agape, and in its ideal form is at best an "impossible possibility," and mutual love which is good will that is reciprocated (73). A little of agape must enter into mutual love or it could not be mutual. Therefore agape has something to do with our historical existence even though it is not to be found alone. Williams attempts to "bring the doctrine of redemption into organic relation with the realization of human good in history" (75). Agape "intends the Kingdom of God, that is, the bringing of all things to creative, dynamic harmony under the sovereign rule of God" (75). This good, which agape intends, includes the good of the self as well as the good of other selves. Therefore, agape is not hostile to self-interest but to its perversion. This view allows Williams to define the good in terms of the fully realized self in the fully realized community. "The love which is revealed in Christ is a love which seeks the fulfillment of all things in such a relationship to one another that what flows from the life of each enriches the life of all, and each participant in the whole life finds his own good realized through the giving of self to the life of the whole" (78). The real good is this community of mutuality.

The rest of the volume deals with the problem of "how far self-realization in the Kingdom of God is possible within human existence as we know it" (82). This leads into exceedingly rewarding analyses of the relation of Christian faith to the political order, and to individual and social ethics. He denies the assumption of Niebuhr and Brunner that power can never be a good in the sense that it can be part of God's agape. He does so by proving that power, even in its most coercive forms, can contribute to the realization of the self in the community. It seems to this reviewer that one must infer from this refutation that anything which can contribute to self-realization becomes agape. We can create conditions that are favorable to the Kingdom of God, though we need not identify our efforts in this direction as being "the activity of God." They are nonetheless such activities as give evidence that we serve an "embattled

Christ" (130). We live "in that history which is determined by the reign of Christ in conflict with his enemies." Williams believes that it is to the credit of the "social gospel" that it destroyed the view that "the kingdoms of this world have been left to other powers" (132). If it is true that it was left to the "social gospel" to do this, we have been poor stewards of Luther's insights.

The chapter dealing with "Time, Progress, and the Kingdom of God" offers a very suggestive and helpful analysis of Kierkegaard and the existential viewpoint. Though one may not agree with the author at all points, we may agree with the basic assertion that there can be meaningful development even in the moral realm, which gives significance to our efforts and our decisions, not only in the "moment" but in the process of history.

The discussion of the Christian doctrine of "vocation" is helpful, although at times it seems to be defined too much in terms of "the Good Society," instead of in terms of its religious ground. The author tries to avoid equating our earthly societies with the Kingdom of God while he asserts the relevance of our efforts for the Kingdom. "The aim of Christian social ethics is to discover and promote the establishment of those conditions which will aid the growth of communities of freedom, justice, and equality. These communities will not be 'the great community,' but they will support that community and be something like it" (167). We must "create according to our best wisdom, the conditions of the Good Society for the sake of the Kingdom of God" (176).

The conclusion to which the author comes is that "it is possible for human beings in response to the power and goodness of God, to begin to will his Kingdom above all other things and to grow toward a more mature expression of that will" (181). God's grace is the basis for man's hope, but it is a real basis, and the hope which springs from it is hope for this world as well as the world to come.

In evaluating this work one must bear in mind that the writer is dealing with a particular aspect of Christian theology which demands that he relate Christian doctrine to the secular areas of knowledge and activity. It is natural, therefore, that he should employ certain universal categories, such as the category of process and the idea of self-realization in stating the meaning of the Christian faith. This does not seem to this reviewer to be a weakness.

There are, however, two serious questions which must be addressed to the author. The first is whether he has actually succeeded in doing what he set out to do. He set out to offer an interpretation of Christian theology which would give full value to our human striving. "We must see the problem of human progress from a Christian interpretation, recognizing that it is not so simple a problem as romantic idealism made it, nor yet so simple as the recent somewhat contemptuous rejections of it suggest" (18). As the argument proceeds, and agape is revised so as to serve as "man's real good," and man's real good is defined in terms of self-realization in the community of mutuality, one comes to feel that the Christian view has been absorbed in a larger view and that it has been justified by virtue of the fact that it makes some contribution to this larger good. For instance, is not the discussion of agape really quite unnecessary to the formulation of "man's real good?" Could it not have been done as well on the basis of Whitehead, Hartshorne, and Bergson? The idea of the "fully realized self in the fully realized community," as it has been formulated in philosophical ethics could be substituted without too great damage to the argument of the book. Of course, this does not mean that it is not Christian, but it does justify some skepticism with regard to the source of it in the New Testament.

The second question which keeps coming to the fore has to do with "original sin." Williams is careful to warn against

the optimism of liberalism and insists that evil must be taken seriously. The conflict in which Christ is engaged is real and it takes place on the field of history. Not even a "long run optimism," can be taken for granted. He even admits that our "human love is actually egocentric, that under the guise of love to God or neighbor we insinuate our inordinate self-love into our most spiritual efforts" (73). Although theoretically agape does not stand entirely outside his desire, practically "when sinful man desires he corrupts the spirit of love." Nowhere does Williams express himself regarding the doctrine of original sin except in criticism of the views of Brunner and Niebuhr (104). At several crucial points, it seems to this reviewer that the positions taken suffer from this failure to come to grips with the fact of egocentricity in man. For instance, in discussing the nature of revelation he warns that knowledge of God is not simple or easy because of the complexity and hiddenness of God. Is not the great barrier to knowing God precisely our insistence on looking at everything from the viewpoint of our own interest? If full justice had been done at this point to the fact of egocentricity, which Williams seems to admit is universal in human experience, he would not have been able to proceed with as much confidence in the statement of several subsequent positions.

But let these questions not detract from a magnificent attempt to do something that badly needs to be done. This reviewer is particularly grateful for the use made of Charles Hartshorne's views, which he has long felt could be applied to evangelical theology with very illuminating results.

EDGAR M. CARLSON

Der christliche Gottesglaube und die Naturwissenschaft. By Karl Heim. Tübingen: Furche-Verlag, 1949.

This is the first half of the fourth volume in the series projected by the celebrated, now octogenarian, Tübingen theologian, on the general theme, "The Evangelical Faith and Present-Day Thought." The first volume was translated under the title, "God Transcendent." The second and third volumes, *Jesus der Herr* and *Jesus der Weltvollender,* have not been translated.

This book is particularly important in view of the present-day tendency to curtail the church's task of apologetics. It recognizes the difficulties for believing presented to the modern man in view of the immensity of the universe, the universality of the struggle for existence now culminating in a third world war, and the intimate connection between body and soul as revealed by psycho-somatic medicine. What Brunner has attempted in the field of social policy in his *Justice and the Social Order,* Karl Heim here attempts in the broader area of a total world view. Strictly speaking this is perhaps not the work of the theologian, but of the Christian philosopher and the Christian scientist, the expert in the respective field. Yet who is better qualified than this learned and well-oriented scholar who in 1904 already published a book *Das Weltbild der Zukunft,* sketching in advance the implications of the findings of science for the conception of the universe, and who was praised by Albert Einstein for his insight into the theory of relativity.

Here is a new kind of apologetics. It does not first picture the world view as presented by the scientist and then try to fit belief in God into this framework. It is rather the search for a starting point which is not vulnerable to the attacks of the methods of the natural sciences, to which in particular it addresses itself. The starting point is the human I which is presupposed in every scientific investigation and then the existence of God which is not amenable to scientific investigation. This leads the author to the reiteration of what was already proposed in the first volume of the series, namely the notion of dimensional beyondness. Both the human ego and the personal God in whose

image man is created occupy a different dimension from that accessible to the methods of the natural sciences. The realization of this fact will not produce faith, nor will it make faith any easier, but it will allow the Christian to confront the unbeliever with an integrated world view which will not be immediately suspect from the scientific or philosophic point of view. It may help to restore to theology its rightful place as the queen of the sciences to which all of them are ancillary.

It is the opinion of this reviewer that the book should be made available to the English reader, not because of some abiding value it may possess for all time, but precisely because it is addressed to the urgency of the moment. The loss of the individual in the masses still threatens. It is the real threat of Communism in the sense of men simply banding themselves together in order thus through the strength of numbers to overcome the anguish and insecurity of the human situation. The "existentialism" of Kierkegaard, Heidegger, and Jaspers provide the dynamic thought-forms in which faith is made to speak to the world today. If it is objected that it is just this tie-up with a passing philosophy which is objectionable inasmuch as it makes the timeless Gospel too "zeitgebunder," i.e., too much involved with a passing time, then it should be remembered that the proclamation of the Gospel never was that of a timeless truth, but it is the Lord himself speaking and what he has to say always was and always will be and must be "zeitgebunden," addressing each generation in its own thought forms.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

Morals and the New Theology. By H. D. Lewis. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948. 160 pages. $2.00.

Here is a book which evangelical thinkers—especially the professors—ought to read. The author is professor of Philosophy in University College in North Wales, Britain, and he writes a dignified, lucid work. But it is withal a slashing, high-powered, incisive attack on points as to which an evangelical will be fighting with him all the way. The book has both its positive viewpoint and its negative criticism of views incompatible therewith—with about 135 pages to the latter, and 25 pages to the former.

The cause for which Professor Lewis takes up the glistening sword is the autonomy of ethical principles, immediately knowable as autonomously real, needing neither metaphysical nor religious support. "A realistic ethics . . . ascribes the central position to the confrontation of the individual by a duty not constituted in any way by his own nature or inclination, a demand altogether outside himself, which burns inexorably into his consciousness." "Morality . . . is self-centered." It "presupposes a system of objective duties, . . . an ultimate ethical truth not requiring support from any other source." "There are distinctive ethical principles which do not depend in any ultimate way on our own reactions and attitudes." "Mature persons have a proper awareness of moral distinctions quite independently of their adoption of any religious faith." "Fundamental ethical knowledge is such that it presents itself directly to the mature person quite independently of . . . religious belief." "The fundamental ideas of ethics . . . have a finality and self-sufficiency not fundamentally different from the principles of arithmetic."

In his zeal for this position—avowedly assumed, but not validated here—the author sees two parties who threaten it—the naturalists and Christian theological thinkers. As to the former, whose offence is to deny any such autonomous moral principles, Lewis does not give much space. The title of the book indicates that it is the other foe he wants to attack here. He might have expected something better from theologians; they ought not to join the naturalists in denying such ethical principles.

It is not that Lewis is against religion as such. He believes in God. He has high

praise for Rudolf Otto. He has sought for *a modus vivendi* between an autonomous ethics and "traditionalist" theology, but unsuccessfully. He laments many errors of which theological liberals have been guilty; but he thinks it is with them that religion is to be delivered from its contradictions and contribute as religion really ought to the enrichment of life.

The title prepares the reader for an attack on "the new theology"—Barth, Brunner, Niebuhr, and such; and that anticipation is not disappointed. But one may be surprised to see how many others feel the blade, once it has begun to swing—O. C. Quick, D. R. Davies, J. S. Whale, the neo-Calvinists, Luther, the Reformation theologians in general, all "traditionalist theology," Augustine, and an "example of liberalism drifting from its moorings," J. C. Bennett!

When the inclusiveness of the onslaught sets one to looking for the fault common to all, one finds that it roots in acceptance of the doctrine of *original sin!* The attendant view of a corrupted humanity and universal sinfulness denies that man can by and in himself find the principles of ethics; and that he could of himself follow them, if he could find them. In fact, the doctrine of original sin leads inevitably to "an ultimate determinism" which leaves no freedom, and therefore no room for a concept of sin. "It is just not possible to retain the idea of genuine sinfulness and guilt within the presuppositions of traditionalist theology." "Sin cannot be in part choice of the individual, in part result of the fall or 'the sin of man.'" Consistent traditionalists—like Barth, Brunner, and Niebuhr—have unintentionally rendered a great service to truth by carrying such theology to its self-refuting outcome. The concepts of sin and guilt are indispensable for any moral society. The hope lies in liberating ethics from dependence on religion. "The absorption of ethics in religion must be steadily resisted." An ethics of autonomous principles keeps firm ground under the indispensable concepts of individual responsibility, sin and guilt. And it does not surrender to paralyzing pessimism; it has confidence in the moral competency and goodness of man.

The vigor of the onslaught against the traditionalist theology is at its fiercest in a chapter entitled "Theology and Reaction"—in Nazi Germany, for instance. There the Confessing Church has been given great credit as the preeminent foe of social injustice and reaction. But the church's main concern was for itself. It "was not in the main a political or social resistance." It came to resistance "somewhat belatedly . . . at the point where Hitler touched the activities of the Confessional Church itself in matters of doctrine and worship." But church leaders gave "almost blasphemous reverence" to the state, "loth to withhold the aura of divine sanction even from the vilest acts of State." The Lutheran Church gave "limited and belated resistance;" and in so doing, it followed "the course pursued with little deviation or dissent, by the Lutheran Churches from the days of their founders to the present." It rooted in the "essential inadequacy" of the Reformation doctrine of the 'two swords.'" "Gogarten . . . arrived at the view that the secular order of the state was the final arbiter in ethical matters." Hirsch maintained "the right of a group to dominate the individual." Pagan movements, like the German Christian Party, "drew their general support and leadership from among members of Protestant Churches" to a significant degree.

The roots of such social ineffectiveness lie in "the proneness of Lutheran thought to absorb the distinctively ethical life, . . . a collectivist view of responsibility, and the denunciation of reason." That theology left people victims of a "bewildering susceptibility to delusion."

It is not the function of this review to offer refutation of the thesis and argument of the book. But it is not hard to see what the answer of evangelical theology would be. The author writes a serious

work, not a diatribe. He is not an illiterate in the field of religion. He has read widely. But for all that he knows his philosophers better than theology. An evangelical could not escape the judgment that the author has pretty completely failed to apprehend the meaning of the central concepts of evangelical theology, of practically all of them—faith, sin, the Word of God, revelation, justification, and the rest.

In conclusion, let it be said that this is a serious and challenging work, worthy of careful study by anyone whose responsibilty it is to deal with Christian ethics.

CARL C. RASMUSSEN

The Church in the World. By Richard R. Caemmerer. St. Louis: Concordia, 1949. 110 pages.

This is a clear, simple, persuasive, and stirring call to the church to perform its proper function in the world. Dr. Caemmerer is a professor at the Concordia Seminary at St. Louis and evidences the traits of a good teacher by first of all clearly defining his terms, analyzing the problem, and then proposing specifically and concretely what needs to be done. The church is the congregation of believers gathered about the means of grace. As such it is the body of Christ. As such it must perform its function in the world. What is meant by the world is then also clearly defined and the outstanding characteristics described. The universal priesthood of believers is to be taken seriously. Each Christian must practice Christian love *(agape)* and must bear the Christian witness *(kerygma)*. It is particularly stressed how the practice of Christian love must prepare the way for the kerygma. All this must be done by the Christian in the family, in business, in all contacts and relationships. Nothing will take the place of "the living, person to person, pervasive and underground communication of living witness" (p. 84). For the ministry, too, there is the necessity of "the reappraisal and revival of the ministerial office as the cure of souls and the witness to Christ (p. 93). All in all it is a helpful call away from institutionalism and reliance upon techniques to a living faith. The resources for this faith are in the fellowship of the church, where the Word of God is proclaimed and the sacraments administered, and in which the living Christ is present to his people. This is vital Christianity and incidentally also good Lutheranism. Characteristic is the frequent reference to the Scriptures although there is no Biblicism apparent. Two criticisms would be a tendency to identify the flesh with the body and the material instead of with the old Adam, and an insufficient recognition of the "simul justus et peccator."

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

Recent Theological Research In Sweden: A Luther Renaissance. By Hjalmar Lindroth. Translated by Gustav Carlberg. Hongkong: 1950.

A work by a Swedish scholar, translated by an American Lutheran, and published in Hongkong in 1950—indeed, an unusual book! It is indicative of the world-wide character of the Lutheran Church when the head of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, in Taofongshan, Hongkong, offers American readers an opportunity of reading a work by a professor of Upsala University.

Professor Lindroth originally wrote a series of essays, "Four Decades of Swedish Luther Research," and issued them in a book entitled, *The Luther Renaissance in Recent Swedish Theology,* in 1941. This, brought up to 1949, is the basis of President Carlberg's translation. Though the volume is less than 150 pages it gives us a clear statement of the principal works of those Swedish theologians in this century who have restudied Luther. Swedish theology in this century has been primarily a study of Luther. It is an impressive list of titles which has been produced by Eklund, Billing, Göransson, Aulen, Runestam, Nygren, Bohlin, Ljunggren, von Engeström, Bring, Törnvall, Wingren,

Josefson, and others, who have sought again for orientation of theology in Luther. Practically every doctrine has been touched upon in their researches, and new vitality has resulted as attention has been turned away from the period of Orthodoxy and Pietism to the original inspiration of the Reformation.

Those who read only English should be grateful to Dr. Carlberg for making available this valuable survey of Swedish theology.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Warum noch Lutherische Kirche? By Hans Asmussen. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1949. 360 pages. DM 12.50.

This book would resume the conservation between Lutheranism and Roman Catholicism discontinued in the sixteenth century. In form it is a discussion of the Augsburg Confession. But its scope is neither historical nor dogmatical in the academic sense of the word. Asmussen is concerned with the significance of the Augsburg Confession for the church in her present struggles, outward and inward. He proceeds from the conviction that it can be understood correctly only if viewed against the Roman teachings and customs which it sought to correct. But he feels that some of its paragraphs do not speak the last word on the questions at issue. And he realizes that the battle fronts run differently today than they did in 1530.

The Roman Catholic Church has learned and purified herself. In the sixteenth century the Lutheran pastor was much closer to the common people than the priest, feared or despised. The average priest of today enjoys (at least in Germany) the love and respect of his people. The bishops of the sixteenth century represented all the corruption and secularization that had crept into the church. Today's Roman Catholic bishops are men of a much higher spiritual caliber. The church of the sixteenth century had to be reminded by the Reformers of the dignity of civil life and its functions. But modern Catholicism takes a constructive interest in secular life and its institutions. Asmussen even believes that masses are no longer sold for money (here again he judges from conditions in Germany).

On the other hand, the Lutheran Church is no longer the same. Its attitude toward the heritage of the first fifteen centuries, monasticism, and spiritual discipline has hardened from criticism to repudiation. Private confession has been lost, liturgical worship has declined, Communion attendance has dwindled (again in Germany).

Finally the world has changed. Society was Christian in the sixteenth century, at least in name and customs. Twentieth century European society makes no such claim. Asmussen therefore finds the Reformers' attitude to the state a bit naïve and unrealistic, especially when applied to modern conditions. At any rate the anti-Christian bias of modern totalitarianism has led to a rapprochement between German Lutherans and Roman Catholics all along the line. Asmussen's book must be understood on the background of these developments.

It is not possible in a short review to trace the author's comments on every one of the twenty-eight articles of the Augsburg Confession. But some of the recurring themes deserve mentioning.

Throughout his book Asmussen contends against a merely intellectual understanding of truth. He refuses to separate the teaching from the praying and witnessing church, let alone to subordinate the latter to the former. The abstract, dogmatical argument may be necessary; but it is only a help to the concrete, pictorial message of the preacher and the actual practice of worship. Dogmatics tend to rationalize the biblical witness, and Asmussen probes for such rationalization in Lutheran as well as in Roman Catholic theology.

He prizes the articles on the sacraments in the Augsburg Confession because they

attempt no neat distinction between the part of God and the part of man in salvation. The philosophical categories of "objective" and "subjective" do not apply here. These categories would require a clear distinction between God's and man's activity. But in the experience of salvation, man is lifted into a "magic circle" where he is both active and passive, receives and gives at the same time. For the sacraments, according to the Augsburg Confession, require as well as produce faith. Here is therefore a type of sacrifice which has nothing to do with the philosophy of *"do ut des,"* here is a type of good work which has nothing to do with work righteousness, here is a kind of reward which is far removed from any idea of "merit." And it is not possible to distinguish the Lutheran and Roman Catholic views under the slogans *opus operatum* and *opus operantis.* In reality both churches stress objective and subjective elements. Catholic teaching demands faith of the recipient. Lutheran doctrine speaks of the *manducatio indignorum.* But both churches fail to appreciate the contemporaneity of the recipient with the dying and rising Christ and with the life of the world to come.

The same emphasis leads Asmussen to a severe criticism of Luther's argument in *De Servo Arbitrio.* Luther and Erasmus agreed that divine and human activity exclude each other. Either one or the other must be mere appearance. But the Passion story forbids dividing credit between God and man. In Christ's passion and death, God's will and the will of sinful man were done at the same time. Asmussen agrees therefore with other writings in which Luther pointed to the cross for an answer to the mystery of human freedom and bondage. But he accuses the Reformer of rationalizing and of predicating far too much about the "Hidden God" in his answer to Erasmus.

Most important for present-day problems is Asmussen's criticism of the attitude of the Reformation toward ecclesiastical order in the broadest sense of that word. In the church which Luther sought to purify, divine and human pronouncements, biblical commands, and mere churchly traditions enjoyed equal respect and sanctity. Asmussen appreciates the Reformers' eagerness to divide the divine and the human, and to free consciences from the bondage of human ordinances. But he feels that this controversy prejudiced them and made them too negative in their attitude toward the whole field of Christian custom and order. They did, indeed, allow for traditions not contrary to the Word of God. But they failed to appreciate their positive value, declaring them *adiaphora,* indifferent things. And indifference permitted liturgical and other ecclesiastical forms to decline slowly but surely in the Lutheran Church. Asmussen is deeply concerned about the formlessness of spiritual life in the Lutheran Church. He does not feel free to criticize formalism in the Roman Church as long as order and discipline are lacking in Lutheran ranks.

With Flaccius he insists that *adiaphora* can become very vital and of more than human authority. The line between essential and unessential issues in the church fluctuates. The difference is relative, not absolute, for though the order of spiritual life is free, it is by no means indifferent. Liturgical orders, church constitutions, religious customs and traditions can and should give fitting expression to our faith. As long as they do that, they are more than merely human ordinances. They are "Bindungen zweiter Ordnung," i.e., secondary duties which may not lightly be disregarded.

This clarification is important especially in view of the present church situation in Europe, for atheistic governments have always camouflaged their opposition to the Christian religion under the cloak of an attack against the outward customs and orders of the church. In this situation the church, for the benefit of her people, should dare to speak openly on the burn-

ing questions of the day, and her ministers should offer responsible advice to the laity in moral decisions. Asmussen visualizes even a sort of evangelical penance in which the pastor would advise a person, oppressed by his guilt, on suitable ways of making restitution to those he wronged. He would also find a legitimate place for voluntary spiritual discipline, as represented in fasting or the monastic vows.

Here, as elsewhere in his writings, Asmussen betrays a very independent cast of mind. Many of his statements will doubtless provoke sharp criticism, for he throws out a profusion of brilliant observations and ideas without developing and proving his theses in detail. His approach is never sterile or hidebound, nor is it academic or exhaustive. But this reviewer feels that even the sharpest criticisms are born out of the author's deep love for the Lutheran Church. Other theologians of our day have tried to represent Lutheranism as a philosophy deductible from one or two basic premises. This tendency has naturally led to a greater emphasis on the differences between Lutheranism and Romanism or Calvinism. Asmussen is much less interested in denominational boundary lines because he is concerned not with a theological system but with the actual, practical tasks of the Lutheran Church today. He seeks no self-justification for the Augsburg Confession, or for the Lutheran Church today, or even for his own theological ideas. He is only concerned about the mind of Christ and how it may lead the Lutheran and all other churches. His view is ecumenical in the best meaning of that word. Church unity cannot be gained by bypassing the Confessions. The Lutheran Church can make her greatest contribution to a world in confusion and Christendom divided by examining her own Confessions in the light of the Word and by putting her findings into practice. In this task Asmussen's book will be both an incentive and a guide.

U. S. Leupold

Mennonite Piety Through the Centuries. Its Genius and Its Literature. By Robert Friedmann. Goshen, Indiana: The Mennonite Historical Society, 1949. xv, 287 pages, with five plates. $3.50.

Only twenty years have passed since Dr. Harold S. Bender, now dean of Goshen College, published his excellent study entitled "Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature, 1727-1928" and thus began a series of English monographs on Anabaptist and Mennonite history. But in this short period his collection of European and American documents in the library of the Mennonite Historical Society at Goshen has proved itself a rich mine of materials from which the growing ranks of Mennonite scholars have been producing useful articles for the *Mennonite Historical Review* and valuable separate monographs. Dr. Friedmann's book is the seventh and most recent of these separate "Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History."

The author is a native of Vienna and received his degree there in 1924. He was engaged in a study of Hutterite manuscripts when the Nazi persecution in 1939 compelled him to flee. For several months he studied at Yale Divinity School and then began his teaching and research at Goshen College. He acknowledges the great help of Dean Bender, particularly in putting the book into its English form. Dr. Friedmann is now professor of history and philosophy at Western Michigan College of Education at Kalamazoo, Michigan.

The book consists of two distinct parts. The first part is a historical study of the relations between Anabaptism and Pietism. It deals with an intricate problem in the history of ideas. It surveys both the evangelical Anabaptist groups (later called Mennonites) and the Pietistic groups in various countries, analyzes their central essence in each case, and marks their similarities, their changes, their contacts, and their contrasts. The chief difference between the Anabaptists and the Pietists

in the denominations he finds in the variety of focus or emphasis. The Pietists would emphasize the doctrine of justification, while the Anabaptists would emphasize the Kingdom of God and the universal priesthood. "The question is: Is the Gospel to be understood through Paul, or is Paul to be understood through the Gospel? He who seeks to secure a total understanding of Holy Scripture from the point of view of Paul, starts with the experience of sin, and experiences salvation in the consciousness of freely bestowed grace. But he who seeks to understand the Holy Scripture from the point of view of the Gospel, starts with the requirement of discipleship *(Nachfolge)*, that is, he starts from the point of view of concrete love and the cross, and takes from them his sense of commission."

The second part of the book deals with "Mennonite Devotional Literature, 1600-1800." It is double the size of Part I and gives the concrete proof of the thesis set forth in the general historical analysis. By a detailed examination of the devotional literature of the Mennonites in various lands through two centuries it depicts the spiritual life of the Mennonites and their Anabaptist antecedents. The central ideas of this literature are found to be "complete discipleship to Christ, a voluntary church of believers only, the sincere practice of Christian love and brotherhood, and the renunciation of all forms of force and violence including warfare." In a general way it may be said that Part I introduces the reader to the history and doctrine of the Mennonites while Part II takes him into their ethics and practical living.

As we read this scholarly volume the conviction deepens that church historians in general have not been fair to the Anabaptists and Mennonites. The writers of history have too often judged all Anabaptists by those radical revolutionaries who called forth the harsh judgments of the contemporary Reformation leaders, and they have overlooked or underestimated the much larger body of Anabaptists whom Friedmann calls "evangelical," the quietistic, suffering advocates of believer baptism who sought only to reproduce primitive Christian character and who became the ancestors of the Mennonites. Now that the sources of information are becoming accessible, we may expect a more equitable treatment of these two groups by church historians of the future. To this development Dr. Friedmann's work makes a major creative contribution. Moreover, his first-hand study of the devotional books of the Mennonites raises the hope that we may soon have a complete and adequate statement of Mennonite theology and ethics.

The book is thoroughly documented. The bibliography lists 217 titles. There is a detailed index.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

The Beginnings of Lutheranism in New York. By Harry J. Kreider. Gettysburg: Times and News Publishing Co., 1949. 76 pages. $1.00.

Written at the request of the United Lutheran Synod of New York to celebrate the 300th anniversary of continued Lutheran organization in America, this little volume deserves wide reading by Lutherans and others. The recovered, translated, and recorded history of the adherents of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession in New Netherland (New York) and their efforts to secure a pastor is filled with surprises.

Here is to be found the oldest Lutheran church on this continent. Here were Lutherans who suffered religious intolerance and a denial of the privilege of having their own pastor three hundred years ago. The West India Company regulations, in 1624, stated that the colonists "shall hold no other services than those of the true Reformed Religion, in the manner in which they are at present" conducted in Holland. Private worship was to be allowed. Of more than usual interest is the fact that this early Lutheran movement

was a laymen's movement. Laymen held the first services and petitioned for the first pastor. They became especially disturbed over the requirement that children be baptized in the Reformed church, that parents or sponsors were asked if they accepted the doctrine of that church, and that children were being taught the Reformed doctrine in their schools. There were some strong Lutheran churches in Holland, where Lutherans were generally tolerated "by connivance." In New Netherland even this was blocked.

Following "private advice" from Holland these Lutherans "assembled themselves secretly, to edify themselves mutually" by prayer, some singing, reading of Scripture with comments, and the reading of a sermon. Such services were suppressed by the governor and his council by an ordinance forbidding any but Reformed services, under penalty of a fine of $240 for "all who presume to exercise the duties of a preacher, reader, or precentor"; and a $60 fine for any "man or woman found at such a meeting."

Persistence finally led to the coming of an ordained pastor, Johannes Ernestus Gutwasser, in July, 1657. This greatly displeased the Reformed and he was ordered deported.

In 1664 the English conquered New Netherland and the Lutherans were granted religious freedom. Though four years elapsed before a pastor was secured, the life and work of the Lutheran organization was now assured.

This brief history is a "must" for pastors and laymen who desire to be familiar with the beginnings of Lutheranism in New York. And it is believed it will prove an appetizer leading to greater knowledge of what happened in connection with the planting of Lutheranism in other colonies.

JOHN B. MOOSE

Story of the Midwest Synod, U.L.C.A. Published by the Midwest Synod, 1950. 392 pages. $2.50. Order from the Rev. A. B. Lentz, Louisville, Nebraska.

Originally intended for the synod's fiftieth anniversary, the publication of this volume had to wait through the war years until the sixtieth anniversary. The delay has permitted the committee in charge a longer time to complete its work and to do it more thoroughly. And there is more success to report.

The result is a substantial volume bound in red cloth. One is impressed at once by the large number of pictures. The committee has evidently been at great pains to get pictures of everything and everyone in any way connected with the synod. There are numerous pictures of synodical conventions. An occasional picture is poor, but considering the type of paper used the general result is good.

But this is far from being a mere picture book. There is ample text for the illustrations. Part I gives the "General History" and includes tabulations of pastors, congregations, conventions, and officers, missionaries, chaplains, and deaconesses. Part II is the "History of our Institutions." These are Tabitha Home, Martin Luther Seminary, Midland College, Central Seminary, and Lutheran Literary Board.

Part III contains the "History of our Organizations," meaning the Women's Missionary Society, the Brotherhood, the Luther League, and the Sunday School. Part IV is devoted to "Our Pastors and Congregations." A page is given to each congregation's history illustrated with a picture of the church building and of the pastor. And there is a full index.

As is often the case when numerous writers are involved, the unity of the work is impaired, and there are duplications. The uniform use of the title "pastor" for every clergyman is monotonous and sometimes meaningless. Some of the pictures—for example, that of the Nebraska State Capitol—might have been omitted without injury to the book.

Nevertheless this volume is a comprehensive collection of data relative to the history of the synod. It will be a useful reference work for many years to come.

And it displays something of the new vigor and aggressiveness of the Midwest Synod in mid-century.

W. D. Allbeck

J. A. Eklund. En biografi. By Elis Malmeström. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1950. 394 pages. S.Kr. 14:50.

Nowhere in the Lutheran Church has there been any equal to the long line of distinguished bishops who have determined the character of the Swedish Church. Germany has its theologians and missionaries, America its pioneers and administrators. But the combination of teacher, scholar, administrator, cultural personality which meets us in the Swedish episcopacy is unique in Lutheran lands.

One of the most distinguished of the modern bishops in the Church of Sweden died in 1945, and his biography has been written by an author who himself has just been named as bishop, Elis Malmeström, successor to Yngve Brilioth in the see of Vexiö. And it is a thoroughly scholarly and engaging book he has produced.

Bishop Eklund of Karlstad throughout his whole life felt that the church must be clear in its attitude toward the culture of his age, and his great achievement was his personal victory over the contemporary anti-religious forces. Because of this victory he could inspire a younger generation to meet the conflict hopefully. Above all he gave his life for the building up of a folk church in his beloved country, making it conscious of the strength it had in the Christian faith and the traditions involved therein. He may well be remembered best for his contributions to Swedish hymnody and his part in the new Swedish hymnal. Not least interesting is the relationship between Eklund and Söderblom—the one a staunch exponent of the church of his fathers, the other the dreamer of dreams for an ecumenical church which future generations might cherish.

Conrad Bergendoff

The Story of Religion in America. By William Warren Sweet. Revised and enlarged edition. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. 492 pages. $3.75.

It is scarcely necessary to do more than call attention to the fact that a third, enlarged edition of this work has appeared, for it has become the standard history of American Christianity since its first publication in 1930. Apart from a few minor changes in the text of the second edition of 1939, the present edition has an additional chapter, "Through a Decade of Storm to the Mid-Century," which reviews some of the effects of the Second World War on the churches, discusses the growing tension between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, mentions the increased importance of radio and motion pictures, and alludes to the "pessimism" of Neo-Orthodoxy.

T. G. Tappert

Christianity and History. By Herbert Butterfield. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950. 146 pages. $2.75.

It is refreshing to find a professional historian discussing the meaning of history and asserting, "Those who complain that technical history does not provide people with the meaning of life are asking from an academic science more than it can give and are tempting the academic historian himself to a dangerous form of self-aggrandizement" (p. 22). Nevertheless, the honest historian must come at length to a "low view of human nature" which in some respects approaches the Christian doctrine of sin. "To have faith in human nature" is heresy for the historian as it is for the theologian (47). The historian may also acknowledge judgment and providence in history, but "we can never pretend to say that those who have suffered the most pitiful catastrophes in history must be regarded as *ipso facto* more wicked than anybody else" (62).

In citing historical illustrations Butterfield sometimes seems to forget this

reservation. Moreover, it is doubtful whether we can be instructed best by ancient history, whose "events are less entangled, so that causes may be seen more clearly leading to their effects" (71). Is not this "simplicity" an illusion resulting from the paucity of sources, from our ignorance rather than from our knowledge?

Such questions are raised because the book is so stimulating. It is one of the soundest treatments of a much-discussed subject that has yet appeared. The author is professor of Modern History in Cambridge University and a Christian of the Methodist persuasion.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

The Individual and His Religion. By Gordon W. Allport. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 148 pages. $2.50.

One of the most interesting developments of the day is the dissolving of the conflict between science and religion. Those who are still engaged in waging this war, afflicting themselves with negatives, and occasioning disturbing doubts are living in an era which has passed. They seem to be unaware that outstanding thinkers, concerned about human destiny, are recognizing that the healthy human being needs both science and religion.

Indeed, they are learning to cooperate in rendering a therapeutic ministry to humanity afflicted with fears and conflicts, disintegration and defeatism. Often the relations between the two are misunderstood because of a difference of vocabulary. "The religious vocabulary seems dignified but archaic; our scientific vocabulary, persuasive but barbaric. 'His Id and superego have not learned to cooperate,' writes the modern mental hygienist. 'The flesh lusteth contrary to the spirit, and the spirit to the flesh,' writes St. Paul. 'Feelings of guilt suggest poor personality teamwork,' says the twentieth century specialist. 'Purify your hearts, ye double-minded,' exhorts St. James. 'The capacity of the ego to ward off anxiety is enlarged if the ego has considerable affection for his fellows and a positive goal to help them.' Correspondingly St. John writes, "Perfect love casteth out fear.'" "It would be difficult," continues Dr. Allport, "I suspect, to find any proposition in mental hygiene that has not been expressed with venerable symbols in some portion of the world's religious literature."

Certainly each functions in its own field. Each performs its mission in its own way. Yet it makes a difference when a scientist is a Christian, and a Christian is a scientist.

Dr. Allport, the psychologist, set himself to the task of discovering the place of religion in the life-economy of the individual. Thus this book was born. It aims to state the "function of the religious sentiment in the personality of the individual." One of the important emphases of the book deals with the process of maturing in religion.

HARVEY D. HOOVER

Leading a Sunday Church School. By Ralph D. Heim, Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1950. 368 pages. $4.75.

No one can even leaf through the pages of this book without getting the feeling that within its covers there is amassed the observations and findings of a lifetime of teaching. Through years of experimentation, of interchange of views, and of actual teaching experience, Dr. Heim has subjected his reading and research to criticism, and in the present volume he now offers the results of his undertaking.

Pastors, Sunday school superintendents, and all engaged in the teaching work of the church on the parish level will find in this book a wealth of information, and a source of many practical suggestions and ideas. Likewise, all who are looking for a clear and sympathetic statement of

the best in the "religious education movement" will find this book an answer to that quest.

In this reviewer's opinion, the second chapter, "Understanding What Christian Education Is," is the weakest portion of the book. It is eloquent testimony to the urgent need of a fresh statement in the field of the philosophy of Christian education by those who represent not the lowest common denominator in religion, but the conviction that in Jesus Christ we have not only the Revealer of principles, methods, and programs, but the Lord. Here, too, it is hard to serve two masters. It is not possible to accept the theology underlying the "religious education movement" and at the same time be true to the New Testament.

GEORGE AUS

Growth in Prayer. By Constance Garrett. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 156 pages. $2.00.

This is a book that pastors and laymen may read with great profit and be grateful for having found it.

Since its title indicates an objective, it may safely be said that no one can read the book without being helped to grow in prayer and to desire to grow still more. Its effect is thoroughly wholesome information leading to an equally wholesome stimulation. It does not aim to produce certain results without aiming at the achievement of the prerequisites—in this case, commensurate growth in grace.

Especially profitable is the treatment of "The Practice of the Presence of God." Certain other aspects of the matter, which may be viewed as techniques, are developed helpfully, and may well serve as guides to those who are not too much given to the use of Retreats, Litanies, Self-discipline, or Mortification. The subject of Holy Communion is treated very satisfactorily.

The book is simply but devoutly written, and deserves to be strongly recommended. It is of more than passing worth.

H. C. LEUPOLD

Christ's "No." By Harold W. Romoser. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1949. Paper, 77 pages. $1.00.

Ten sermons on the Passion of Christ, seven of them on Christ's "No's" as uttered in the last hours of his life, are offered in this little book. The latter are studies of our Lord's rejection of willfulness, violence, insincerity, curiosity, sentimentalism, self-indulgence, and hatred. The author's style is fresh and idiomatic. His conception of a Lenten service is given in these words: "Services in such Passion seasons as this He wants notable, not for eyes and ears stirred by pomp and pageantry, but notable for worshiping hearts moved by His Word to know and repent their murderous sinfulness." A volume of sermons based on our Lord's affirmations should follow.

WM. D. STRENG

Books for Children of Various Ages.

Gift books for children are appearing in larger number. Here is a check list of some recent ones. *Thine is the Glory,* by Florence M. Taylor (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948), 65 cents, is an illustrated interpretation of the Lord's Prayer in meaningful modern terms which may be read to or by children up to ten. Intended for the same age group is C. Umhau Wolf's *Freddie,* with drawings in color by Jim Seed (Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1948), which provides both entertainment and instruction in race relations. Three paper-bound booklets, containing old as well as new prayers for a variety of occasions in the experience of children, are *My First Book of Prayers,* compiled by Esther Cannom for ages three to six, 35 cents; *Children of the Heavenly Father,* compiled by Elinor C. Johnson for ages six to nine, 35 cents; *My Prayer Book,* by Margaret M. Carl-

son for ages nine to fourteen, 35 cents (Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1950). More elaborate in form and content is the little book of twenty-six prayer poems by Grace Noll Crowell, delicately illustrated by Lee Mero, in *A Child Kneels to Pray* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950), $1.00. In like format is a small collection of Bible stories intended as aids to parents and teachers in retelling these stories to children, *Jesus and the Children,* by N. N. Ronning (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950), $1.00. Thirty-one daily devotions for elementary school children, consisting of Bible verse, simple explanation, and prayer poem, illustrated, are offered in *Day by Day with Jesus,* by Gladys A. Sandberg (Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1948), 75 cents. Verses and sketches which successfully suggest the spiritual significance of everyday things in the lives of children of various ages are available in *Happy Days,* by Mabel Nelson Thor (Rock Island: Augustana, 1949), $1.00. Children over ten will enjoy the adventure story of a boy and girl in pioneer Minnesota, *North to St. Paul,* by A. T. Almer (Rock Island: Augustana, 1948), 75 cents. Not so distinctively Christian in character are the interesting stories translated from the Norwegian by Russell A. Peterson, *Children's Tales from Norway,* by Christian Paulsen (Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1950), $1.50.

Evangelisches Gutachten zur Dogmatisierung der leiblichen Himmelfahrt Mariens. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1950. Paper, 24 pages. DM .90.

Before the papal pronouncement of the dogma of the assumption of Mary, the mother of Jesus, Professor Edmund Schlink, assisted by some of his colleagues on the faculty of Heidelberg University, prepared a statement in the form of a plea to Roman Catholic theologians in Germany to use their influence to dissuade the Vatican from elevating the pious opinion into a dogma. The privately circulated plea having failed to achieve its purpose, it has now been published. It argues that Mary's assumption was not a part of the Christian faith during the first five centuries of our era, that the dogma will have serious consequences with respect to Mariology and Christology, the conception of faith and the doctrine of the church, and that it will deepen the gulf between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The restraint and the insight of the statement are noteworthy.

T. G. Tappert

The Christianity of Main Street. By Theodore O. Wedel. New York: Macmillan, 1950. 112 pages. $2.00.

This is a forthright attempt to demonstrate that what is commonly accepted as Christianity in popular Protestant circles is so far removed from classical Christianity as to deserve the designation of "another gospel." The author seeks to establish his thesis by a series of contrasts between what he calls humanist and classical Christianity.

For the former, Christianity can be reduced to a moral idealism based on the teachings and example of Jesus; for the latter, the teachings and example of Jesus must be seen on the much larger background of a divine drama involving one in faith in a God who acts in history for the redemption of mankind. For the former, Jesus is a religious hero much like the principal figure in a log-cabin-to-White-House story, which has been left for our emulation; for the latter, the New Testament record of Jesus is rather that of a White-House-to-log-cabin story in which the climax is reached when the principal figure reveals who he really is—the Lord of glory. The former says, "Be good and you may become worthy of meeting God." The latter declares, "Meet God through repentance and faith and you will become good."

To those who sense that there are some

real differences between what they now read and what they were taught in childhood, but who have not been able to put their fingers on what the differences are, this book will be of real assistance. For those who are preaching to children of this generation, this analysis should prove very helpful.

GEORGE AUS

The Dagger and the Cross. An Examination of Christian Pacifism. By Culbert G. Rutenber. New York: Fellowship Publications, 1950. 134 pages. $1.00.

This is an interesting, informative, well-written little book, but still not convincing. More than is usually the case, the author recognizes the strength of arguments against pacifism, and in one chapter, probably the best, confronts the problem of the state fairly and realistically. It is in the realm of the citizens' obligations to the state that we find "the most searching of all questions for the pacifist position" (78). To this reader the questions are not convincingly answered. Nor does the author's philosophy of history, which many Christians would share with him, seem to aid in a solution. For if there will always be wars, this does not help the Christian to decide what to do in any particular war. And the writer is driven to admit that "no final, all-satisfying answers can be given. And this remains true whether one is a pacifist or not" (103). He goes even further—"the appeal to intuition must be our final appeal in the matter of Christian pacifism" (132). Again, this proves little. For despite all the reasons which might lead the non-pacifist to *want* to be pacifist, there is a deep intuition within him that it is *not* God's will that he should refuse to bear arms in the defense of what at least appears to be a righteous cause. If ultimately intuition is the source of judgment then it behooves the pacifist not to indulge in sarcasm (e.g. "to fight like a Christian," p. 69) and one may question the propriety of a title such as *The Dagger and the Cross* when the implication is that pacifists represent the Cross. Pacifists know what suffering they experience when the state orders them to participate in war. Is there not as great anguish in the hearts of those Christians who do what they believe is necessary for the defense of all they hold precious, including their faith? They go, but through no compulsion of logic. They go because they cannot do otherwise. Since "each man must make up his own mind, in fear and prayer, as to what the implications of his Christian discipleship are" (104), each should respect the decision of the other, and realize that both may be under the Cross.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Snapshots. By Bernard H. J. Habel. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. 167 pages. $1.25.

This collection of fifty-two informal sketches, brought together in a more or less random fashion, is written in a very readable style and will provide delightful and thought-provoking material for the person with a Christian viewpoint.

The book approaches the problems and the joys of the home missionary in a way that is both familiar and appreciative. Hundreds of such books could be written if men of the talent and ability of the author could be brought into contact with the people whose experiences have built the Acts of the Apostles through the ages.

Arranged as it is, it provides a wealth of material for pastors and teachers who desire a particular incident that is historically accurate and refreshingly Christian for each Sunday of the year. The naming of names and places and exact locations gives the material a personal touch that lifts it entirely out of the realm of fiction and makes it of increased value as an authentic record of the people and places reported.

The style is interesting and personal. The accounts are short and to the point. The reader has the feeling of entering the family circle of the author and sharing

in the intimate and personal memories and accounts of each individual portrayed in the sketches.

A few of the applications are a little over-simplified. For example: Having wounded a sparrow the author compares the bluejay that attacked the sparrow to the gangsters in our human life; but even here the account is thought-provoking and stimulates conclusions other than those the author has drawn by the account itself.

It is the kind of book to be left on the table where the children will find it, or where adults who are weary of all the reports of the economic and social tragedies of the world wish to read something that is refreshing and encouraging in the face of our developing complexities.

R. D. LECHLEITNER

The American Book of Common Prayer, Its Origin and Development. By John Wallace Suter and George Julius Cleaveland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. 85 pages. $1.50.

This book is being published to commemorate the four hundredth anniversary of the Book of Common Prayer. It considers the interests of the American reader and tells him how the Book of Common Prayer came to our shores and was used here. Then it traces the book itself through its various stages of development—the preparation of the 1549 Book, the 1662 Book, the American Book of Common Prayer, and lastly offers a careful evaluation of what the Prayer Book should and does mean to them that use it.

Obviously such books as this one aim to cultivate an appreciation of the forms of worship used in a church by showing the process of careful development through which these forms went and how they were always very precisely adapted to the changing needs of the times. It is surprising how interestingly the story of the Prayer Book may be written, and how wholesome such instruction can be.

Obviously this is a book designed for the distinctive needs of the Protestant Episcopal Church and for students of liturgics. It makes us wish that the Lutheran Church had more popular works of interpretation of her own beautiful liturgy.

H. C. LEUPOLD

Evangelischer Aufbruch. By Walter Franke. Hamburg: Reich & Heidrich, Evangelischer Verlag, 1948. 128 pages. DM 3.

This volume contains a series of theological reflections on some current events in the Evangelical Churches of Germany. The author is a layman and is director of the Evangelical Press Service at Frankfurt.

Of special interest for us was the first part dealing with the conceptions of mercy, justice, and love in their effect on the Inner Mission work of Germany. Here the writer gives a critical evaluation of an address of Bishop Lilje delivered at Bethel near Bielefeld on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of German Inner Missions. In this address the bishop pleaded for a "theological" conception of mercy. Ordinarily, man's mercy is "untheological," i.e. he gives from the abundance of his possessions in order to alleviate a pressing need of his fellowmen. But such giving leaves man's condition basically unchanged. Divine mercy, on the other hand, is creative. It establishes a new order for man in his relation both to God and to his fellowmen.

Here we meet with a criticism of Protestant Inner Missions in Germany which, in our eyes, is a wholesome corrective of the narrow social outlook of the whole movement. As compared with Great Britain and America, the social outlook of German Protestantism remained fundamentally conservative in both economics and politics. This explains, at least in part, the tragic fact

that the German churches were not able, despite the great and impressive number of Christian workers and of charitable institutions, to hold or to recapture the loyalty of the working classes. There were only a few who stood for a more radical policy: for example, Friedrich Naumann, who became the leader of the Progressive Liberals, and Christoph Blumhardt, at Bad Boll.

The little volume is a valuable contribution to a study of contemporary life in the German churches and may be sincerely recommended to the interested reader.

OTTO W. HEICK

Der Kommende. By Helmut Echternach. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950. 186 pages. DM 10.

This volume presents a fresh interpretation of the Revelation of St. John for the present day. The author is a teacher of systematic theology in the Kirchliche Hochschule in Hamburg, Germany. Educated at the universities of Königsberg, Basel, Berlin, and Greifswald, he spent about fifteen years in the pastorate before assuming his present position. He has written several other volumes.

In his approach to the Apocalypse Dr. Echternach regards it as undoubtedly the work of the writer of the Fourth Gospel. He outlines the book under four major headings: I. The Awakening Call; II. The Concept of Church History; III. The Final Struggle between Church and World; and IV. The Outlook.

Influenced by Heidegger, he interprets history in existential terms. Past, present, and future are all one. The Apocalypse reflects not so much an historical setting in the closing decade of the first century as a present relevance. The living and exalted Lord is coming to his church today, making its history and experience profoundly clear and terribly meaningful.

What we have in the Revelation is a conversation or dialog of God with us today. He speaks in word, sermon, and revelation, and we answer in chorus, worship, and act. Our response is not individual but communal, the answer of the concrete church in its living faith and confession.

Church history is final history, the answer to the query of world-history. Its reference is not so much to the end of time as to the goal set by God. Pagan concepts involve endless cycles of history or an ending in death. Only Scripture knows time that leads to a goal.

John's Revelation answers the pessimism of paganism and the superficial optimism of the spirit of progress with the paradox of the Gospel of the exalted Christ. He is speaking to us in his Word through the church today. Our task is to hear and answer.

Students of the Apocalypse will find this volume interesting and challenging.

E. E. FLACK

Books Received

Albert T. W. Steinhaeuser, *The Man of Sorrows.* Reprint edition. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. 293 pages. $2.50.

W. A. Poovey, *Problems That Plague the Saints.* Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1950. 184 pages. $2.00.

James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. 526 pages. $15.00.

Theophile J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins.* Revised edition. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. 246 pages. $3.00.

Edgar J. Goodspeed, *Life of Jesus.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. 248 pages. $3.00.

Hugh T. Kerr, *Positive Protestantism. An Interpretation of the Gospel.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950. 147 pages. $2.50.

Paul L. Johnson, *Christian Love.* Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 240 pages. $3.00.

Eugen Rosenstock Huessy, *The Driving Power of Western Civilization.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1950. 126 pages. $2.00.

Alvin E. Magary, *Saints Without Halos.* Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 176 pages. $2.00.

Philip David Bookstaber, *The Idea of Development of the Soul in Medieval Jewish Philosophy.* Philadelphia: Maurice Jacobs, Inc., 1950. 104 pages. $2.00.

John Baillie, *The Belief in Progress.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951. 240 pages. $2.75.

Jaroslav Pelikan, *From Luther to Kierkegaard.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 171 pages. $2.75.

Walter A. Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. 409 pages. $6.00.

Amos Lundquist, *Inspiration for Today.* Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1950. 244 pages. $2.50.

Melva Rorem, *Ten Studies in the Church Through the Centuries.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. Paper, 72 pages. 40 cents. (Leadership text based on C. A. Wendell's *Little Journeys in His Kingdom.*)

J. M. Weidenschilling, *The Early Christian Church According to the Book of Acts.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. Teacher's Guide, paper, 175 pages. $1.25. Pupil's Manual, paper, 168 pages. 75 cents. (Twenty-eight chapters, one for each chapter of the Book of Acts, suitable for adolescents in church schools.)

John W. Doberstein, *The Lord's Prayer.* Chicago: National Lutheran Council Division of Student Service, 1949. Paper, 55 pages. (Encouragement to prayer and an exposition of the Lord's Prayer "with Luther's help," for college students.)

Olin C. Fjelstad, *The Cross Is Central.* Lenten Meditations. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. Paper, 43 pages. 35 cents. (Seven sermonettes on the centrality of the cross in our need, redemption, salvation, sanctification, prayers, baptism, Communion.)

Theodore Graebner, *Faith Healing.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 36 pages. 10 cents. (Tract on methods of faith healers with an appraisal of their claims.)

Erling Nicolai Rolfsrud, *Church Etiquette for the Layman.* Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1950. Paper, 64 pages. 30 cents. (Manual on manners in church, ushers, flowers, music, weddings, funerals.)

CONTRIBUTORS

Paul L. Holmer is a member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota, in the Department of Philosophy.

The Rev. William E. Hulme is college chaplain at Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa.

Frances Swarbrick is the wife of a Lutheran pastor serving a parish of the United Lutheran Church in Anna, Ill.

The Rev. Stewart Herman is the director of the Lutheran World Federation's Service to Refugees, with headquarters at Geneva, Switzerland.

Edgars Kiploks is a Latvian pastor now in Watertown, South Dakota. He was formerly a member of the theological faculty of the University of Latvia.

Gustav F. Wingren is a member of the theological faculty of the University of Lund, Sweden. The translator, Eric Wahlstrom, is professor of New Testament at Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.

Dr. R. Jauernig is archivist of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Thuringia, Germany, and has been in charge of the Weimar Edition since 1945.

Ralph D. Heim is professor of Christian Education at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Among the reviewers in this number are Arthur C. P. Hays, professor of the New Testament in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; Russell D. Snyder, professor of the New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; H. Karl Ladwig, pastor of Grace Church, Chicago, and part-time instructor in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; Eric H. Wahlstrom, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Seminary; E. E. Flack, dean of Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; Raymond T. Stamm, professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; Edgar M. Carlson, president of Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota; Martin J. Heinecken, professor of Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; Carl C. Rasmussen, professor of Systematic Theology in the Gettysburg Seminary; Ulrich S. Leupold, professor of the New Testament and Liturgics in Waterloo Seminary, Ontario, Canada; Abdel Ross Wentz, president of the Gettysburg Seminary; John B. Moose, professor of Church History in the Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina; Willard D. Allbeck, professor of Church History in Hamma Divinity School; George Aus, professor of Systematic Theology and Education in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; H. C. Leupold, professor of the Old Testament and Liturgics in Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio; R. D. Lechleitner is executive secretary of the Board of American Missions, American Lutheran Church; Otto W. Heick is professor of Systematic Theology in the Seminary of Canada, in Waterloo, Ontario.